

R. TUZMUHAMEDOV

How the National
Question Was Solved
in Soviet Central Asia
(A Reply to Falsifiers)



PROGRESS PUBLISHERS

MOSCOW

Translated from the Russian by David Fidlon

Р. А. Тузмухамедов

Национальное освобождение народов Средней Азии
(Ответ клеветникам)

На английском языке

First printing 1978

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
1. Central Asia	11
2. The Position of Our "Critics"	17
3. The "Critics": Who Are They? :	38
4. Marxism-Leninism on the Interrelationship Between the Struggle for National Liberation and Social Emancipation	46
5. Double Oppression	60
6. The Liberation of the Central Asian Peoples	68
7. Imperialist Efforts to Stifle the National Liberation Movement of the Central Asian Peoples :	99
8. The Programme for Overcoming Backwardness	127
9. A Leap into Socialism	140
10. Economic Prospects for 1975	166
11. Inviolable Friendship of Peoples	171
12. In Lieu of a Conclusion	190

Dedicated to the memory of Soviet Orientalist Abdulkhak Tuzmuhamedov (1899-1968), participant in the rout of Ataman Bakich, veteran of the Great Patriotic War; Alim Sharafutdinov (1905-1943), Corresponding Member of the Uzbek Academy of Sciences, prominent authority on Navoi, killed in action in the Great Patriotic War; Glazunov Vassily (1897-1967), participant in the struggle against the whiteguards and *basmachi* in Central Asia (1918-24), Lieutenant-General, twice Hero of the Soviet Union.

"It is no exaggeration to say that the establishment of proper relations with the peoples of Turkestan is now of immense, epochal importance for the Russian Socialist Federative Soviet Republic.

"The attitude of the Soviet Workers' and Peasants' Republic to the weak and hitherto oppressed nations is of very practical significance for the whole of Asia and for all the colonies of the world, for thousands and millions of people."

From U. I. Lenin's letter "To the Communists of Turkestan", November 1919

1. CENTRAL ASIA

Central Asia, the southernmost part of the Soviet Union, has an area of 1,279,300 square kilometres. The aggregate territory of the Soviet Central Asian republics is larger than that of any European state, and only a few Asian, African and Latin American states are bigger than the republics of Soviet Central Asia. This vast territory, however, has a population of only 20 million.

This is due to the fact that two largest deserts in the USSR, the Kara-Kum and the Kyzyl-Kum, meaning Black Sands and Red Sands, divided by the great Amu-Darya River, are situated in this part of the country. Extending for a thousand kilometres from the Caspian Sea to the foothills of the Tien-Shan, one of the world's highest mountain chains, these deserts cover half of Central Asia.

In the east the deserts give way to valleys rimmed by the towering Altai, Pamir and Tien-Shan mountains which occupy a third of Central Asian territory.

As a result of all these factors Central Asia has a great variety of climates, and it is the hottest region of the country (Termez, Shirobad and Repetek) where the summer temperature is sometimes as high as $+50^{\circ}\text{C}$ in the shade. The winter temperature in the valley of the Aksai River drops to -50°C . Although Central Asia is mostly arid, it has one of the most humid spots in the USSR: the annual precipitation in the extreme east on the slopes of the Kirghiz Range close to the Adyghin River is 2,958 mm, which is greater than in Batumi, the wettest spot on the coast of the Black Sea.

The Karagiye Depression (132 metres below sea level), the world's deepest, is situated in the westernmost part of Central Asia, near its state border. And in the east, among the rugged chains of the Pamirs resplendent in their wild beauty, soars the Soviet Union's highest peak (7,495 metres).

The country's greatest glaciers are situated in these mountains. Central Asian rivers, mountain lakes, eternal snows and glaciers have vast resources of water, but in the valleys, however, it is hot and there are parching deserts. People there have always known the full value of water. Farming in Central Asia depends largely on irrigation and it has the country's largest irrigated area totalling over five million hectares.

Conditions are favourable for cultivating cotton, kenaf, melons and fruits and for breeding karakul and other sheep.

Central Asia has vast mineral resources, including gas and gold which are being developed at a particularly rapid rate of late.

It is a region of ancient culture where many civilisations have succeeded each other in the course of thousands of years. Here stands Samarkand, one of the world's oldest cities, which, according to the recently conducted studies, was founded much more than 2,500 years ago. In the West Tamerlane's name is invariably connected with the history of Central Asia. But long before it had seen such high civilisations as Kushan, Bactrian, Sogdian, Maverannahr and others.

Aphrosiab tombs, ruins of palaces, observatories and medresseh of the Timurides and other magnificent monuments dating back to the Middle Ages, attract tourists from all over the world.

This ancient and rich land which had often suffered from the inroads of numerous invaders is the home of the Uzbeks, Tajiks, Turkmenians, Kirghizes and Kara-Kalpaks.

On the eve of the Great October Socialist Revolution they were oppressed both by tsarism and by local exploiters—feudal lords, clergy, traders and money-lenders, who incited the Central Asian nations against each other in order to keep them in submission.

The Bolsheviks proclaimed the liberation of the peoples not on paper, as the bourgeoisie had often done, but in practice. "To the old world," Lenin wrote, "the world of national oppression, national bickering, and national isolation the workers counterpose a new world, a world of the unity of the working people of all nations, a world in which there is no place for any privileges or for the slightest degree of oppression of man by man."¹

The nationalities policy of the socialist state was founded on the Leninist principle: "... a *voluntary* union of nations—a union which precludes any coercion of one nation by another—a union founded on complete confidence, on a clear recognition of brotherly unity, on absolutely voluntary consent".²

As a result, the formerly oppressed peoples of the one-time tsarist colony of Central Asia are now freely developing in their national states, the Soviet Socialist republics of Uzbekistan, Tajikistan, Turkmenia and Kirghizia and the Kara-Kalpak Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic.

Besides the Uzbeks, Tajiks, Turkmenians, Kirghizes, Kara-Kalpaks there are also people of other nationalities in the Central Asian republics, and all of them enjoy complete equality. This also applies to such unique ethnic groups which have preserved fragments of ancient Central Asian history through the centuries.

The following two examples will serve to illustrate this point. The first is closer to us in time. Thirteen centuries have passed since the Arabs invaded Central Asia. And today an Arab will be surprised to hear one of his native dialects spoken near Bukhara. Here, in the valley of the Zeravshan, there are four villages inhabited by approximately 6,000 Arabs, descendants of those Arabs who had participated in the 7th-century campaigns. Some of them assert that they are the descendants of the ancient Arab tribes of Koreish, Shai-bani and Sanoni. Some old women here wear the *ghizi*, an ancient head-dress of ornamented red fabric.

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 18, p. 92.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. 30, p. 293.

Another example. Starting up the Zeravshan from the four villages, you will pass Samarkand and from Pyanjikent you will find yourself sailing along a section of the river which is being gradually squeezed between the great Turkistan and Zeravshan mountain ranges. This will be Tajikistan. The further upstream you sail the higher the mountains. The river roars and froths with still greater ferocity. And if at a height of 2,000 metres you turn to the right and enter Zeravshan's tributary Fan-Darya, which a rare person is capable of doing, and sail another 75 miles upstream you will reach the canyon of the Yagnob, a tributary of the Fan-Darya. It is a gloomy, naked canyon hugged by the Zeravshan and Gissar ranges and surrounded by snow-capped peaks towering from four to five thousands metres above the sea level.

Helicopters connect the Yagnob Canyon with the outside world, for the paths leading to it run through mountain passes that are accessible only for a few months a year.

About a century ago an expedition discovered a hitherto unknown nationality here, the Yagnobs. Bearing no resemblance to the Tajiks, these mountain dwellers have fair hair, blue eyes and dress in an unusual manner. The biggest surprise was that this small nationality, now numbering not more than 2,500, spoke a completely unknown language which for a long time remained undeciphered.

In 1933, during archaeological excavations on the site of a fortress on Mount Mugh, the last stronghold of the last Sogdian King Divashtich, a large number of written documents were unearthed which no one could decipher.

Perhaps these two mysteries would have remained unfathomed if they had not been explored together thus enabling scientists to arrive at the correct conclusion. It turned out that the Yagnobs descended from the Sogdians who had taken refuge in these inaccessible mountains and that their language was that of the ancient Sogdians.

The six thousand Arahs living on the fringe of the Kyzyl-Kum desert in Uzbekistan, and the 2,500 Yagnobs living in a remote canyon in Tajikistan, just as all the other peoples of the USSR, are equal citizens of the great multinational socialist state.

All the Central Asian peoples live in a friendly family of over a hundred equal nations and nationalities in a unique multinational federation—the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Soviet power has made singular headway in solving the national question. In its "Address to Workers, Peasants, Soviet Intelligentsia, Men of the Soviet Army and Navy, to All Citizens of the Great Land of Soviets" published in 1970, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union noted:

"A great historical achievement of the socialist system has been the solution of the national question, the abolition of national oppression and inequality, the triumph of the Leninist principles of the friendship of the peoples.

"In our country there are neither privileged nor underprivileged nations, there is no and cannot be any discrimination against people because of their nationality. All nations and nationalities, large or small, united in a voluntary indissoluble union, enjoy equal rights and share the responsibility for the future of the socialist homeland.

"The consolidation of the single socialist system of economy has placed the advanced forms of socialist production within reach of all peoples. Fraternal solidarity, mutual assistance and fruitful co-operation of the peoples of the Soviet Union have enabled many of them to eliminate their age-old backwardness within a short space of time and attain the heights of social and economic progress. Where once lay lifeless deserts and vast tracts of uncultivated land there are now industrial centres, giant electric power stations and fertile fields with ramified irrigation systems.

"The sons and daughters of the multinational Soviet people work hand in hand directing their combined efforts to strengthen the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

"The Leninist ideology of friendship and fraternity, the ideology of socialist internationalism, has played a decisive role in moulding the new moral make-up of nations, in effectuating a most profound and all-embracing cultural revolution.

"The Communist Party is following the Leninist line of achieving an all-round drawing together of nations, of aug-

menting their mutual assistance in economic development, of improving the mutual exchange of achievements in material and cultural spheres and of overcoming the vestiges of nationalism. The best national traditions of each people are enriched by a new socialist content and are harmoniously combined with internationalist traits and traditions of the entire Soviet people."

Such are the actual achievements of this policy. They are instructive and they speak for themselves. They are the pride of those who attained them and they are welcomed by our friends. Unwilling to reconcile themselves to the gains of the peoples of Soviet Central Asia, and lacking facts to besmear them, the ill-wishers and undisguised enemies of the Soviet Union resort to outright falsification.

And so, what do the so-called critics of the Soviet nationalities policy in Central Asia want to convey, and what is their "position" in this question?

2. THE POSITION OF OUR "CRITICS"

By carrying through the Leninist nationalities policy, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has proved that it is possible to solve the national question and bring about the national liberation of the peoples. In our country an end has been put to national oppression, to the division of nations and to enmity between them. The equality and sovereignty of all peoples of Russia, their right to self-determination up to and including secession and formation of independent states; abolition of all national and national-religious privileges and restrictions and the free development of national minorities and ethnic groups living in Russia—all these principles set forth in the "Declaration of the Rights of the Peoples of Russia" adopted in the first days of the October Revolution, have played a tremendous role in consolidating the social, political and ideological unity of the multinational Soviet society.

In response to this fact and despite it, our "critics" persist that the "Lenin's 'solution' of the nationality problem offers an excellent example of the futility of engineering solutions for human dilemmas. . . . The national problem in the Soviet Union surely has not been 'solved'."¹ These words belong to US Professor Richard Pipes, an "authority" on Central Asian affairs notorious for his anti-Soviet views, who wrote them in connection with the 50th anniversary of the establishment

¹ R. Pipes, "The Solution of the Nationality Problem", *Studies on the Soviet Union*, New Series, Vol. VI, No. 3, 1967, pp. 39, 47.

of Soviet power. Using different words some other "critics" have expressed and continue to express the same view.

And there are many such "critics", for our ideological enemies have been "criticising" the ways and methods of national liberation in Central Asia ever since the victory of the October Socialist Revolution.

Naturally, this "criticism" has undergone a considerable evolution over the years but its content has remained unchanged. To see this it will suffice to glance at the titles of the publications put out in this period.

The main thing that catches the eye is the rapid swelling of the stream of thick and thin books whose authors intentionally distort the way in which the Soviet power has solved the national question in Central Asia and the history of the liberation of this former tsarist colony as a result of the October Socialist Revolution.

One of the first of these books appeared in Paris in 1928. Written by Mustafa Chokayev, former head of the so-called Kokand Autonomous Government of Turkestan, it was published in French under the title *Les Soviets en Asie Centrale*. Anti-Soviet in content it was written in reply to the statement of the delegation of the French Communist Party giving a truthful account of what it had seen during its visit to the USSR and its tour of Central Asia made on the occasion of the 10th anniversary of the October Socialist Revolution. An enlarged Russian translation of the book came out in Paris in 1935¹. Since then about a hundred books have been published, of which 85 per cent in the post-war period. One can judge of the rate of growth in the number of such publications by the fact that in 1967 six books on this subject were published in the United States alone. Numerous publications of this kind were published in 1967 in keeping with the plans of imperialist propaganda centres to "mark" the 50th anniversary of Soviet power in their own way. For example, the entire September-October 1967 issue of the *Problems of Communism*, the principal anti-communist periodical of the United States Information Agency, was

¹ Mustafa Chokay Ogly, *Turkestan under the Soviets*, Paris, 1935.

devoted to the nationalities and the national question in the USSR.

Another characteristic feature is the change in the geography of these publications. In the pre-war years, most of them came out in Turkey, whereas now the majority are published in the USA, Britain, the Federal Republic of Germany and France.

Finally, it should be noted that before the Second World War anti-Soviet books were penned either by bourgeois nationalists who had fled from the socialist revolution or Turkish Pan-Turkists, whereas today their authors are mostly Americans, Englishmen, Germans and Frenchmen who have made a profession out of writing anti-Soviet books and articles. The most notorious of them are Vernon V. Aspaturian, Serge A. Zenkovsky, Edward Allworth, Alexander G. Park, Richard Pipes, Michael Rywkin and Elizabeth E. Bacon in the USA; Olaf Caroe, Walter Kolarz, J. A. Newth, Hugh Seton-Watson, Geoffrey Wheeler, Alex Nove and Ann Sheehy in Britain; Alexandre Bennigsen, Hélène Carrère d'Encausse, Chantal Lemerrier-Quelquejay in France and Boris Meissner and Stefan Wurm in the Federal Republic of Germany.

To be sure, as the Soviet Union built up and consolidated its foundation—the socialist friendship of peoples—they concentrated their efforts on undermining the international unity of the Soviet peoples and counterposing the Central Asian peoples against the Russians. A retrospective analysis clearly shows that this theme is being played up with increasing persistence in all anti-Soviet literature. For instance, Mustafa Chokayev, the fugitive head of the so-called Kokand Autonomous Government, an "authority" on this subject in the twenties and thirties and the editor of the first "émigré" magazine *Yash Türkistan* (published in Berlin from 1929 to 1939), not only propagandised bourgeois nationalism and Pan-Turkism but also devoted much space to a pessimistic "analysis" of the prospects of the economic, cultural and political development of the Central Asian peoples. He even scoffed the very idea of the possibility of any progress in these spheres. But what had actually taken place in the Soviet Union overturned all his "forecasts".

In this connection mention should be made of the books and magazine articles written by Vali Kajum-Han and Baymirza Hayit, two renegades, former Gestapo officers who participated in punitive operations and who are now collaborating with the US intelligence. They do not indulge in ridiculous forecasts similar to those made by their fore-runner Mustafa Chokayev who claimed that the economic, political and cultural development of the peoples of Central Asia was impossible within the composition of the Soviet Union. Writing in the weedy *Milli Türkistan* magazine published in the name of the so-called Department of Struggle for the National Liberation of Turkestan of the Unity Committee of National Turkestan ("Milli Türkistan birlik komitasi"), established by the nazis as far back as 1942, Kajum-Han and Hayit admit that the peoples of Soviet Central Asia have made tremendous progress in these spheres. Yet in their opinion the Central Asian peoples should concentrate not on promoting living standards, economic progress and cultural development, but on conserving their narrow national interests and strive for national self-isolation. This is the subject of Kajum-Han's writings in which he instructs those, who, in his opinion, "erroneously understand colonialism".¹ He is echoed by Baymirza Hayit in an article entitled "Socialist Nations in the Soviet Union and the Question of the Liquidation".² The more they write the more emphatic is their appeal to "rise against the Russians".

Such a significant evolution in argumentation—rejection of arguments defeated by Soviet reality—is typical not only of bourgeois nationalists but also of their present-day masters. This may be seen from the latest utterances of such an "authority on Central Asian affairs" as the ex-chief of the Central Asian Research Centre in London Lieutenant-Colonel Geoffrey Wheeler, retired, who was permanent editor of the *Central Asian Review* magazine (until its merger with the *Mizan Letter* magazine in 1968), and is the author of the books *Racial Problems in Soviet Muslim Asia*

¹ V. Kajum-Han, *Milli Türkistan*, Oşak-Şubat, 1965.

² Ibid.

(London, 1959), *The Modern History of Soviet Central Asia* (London, 1964) and the article "Soviet Central Asia" (London, 1966). The historical development over the past century has shown the world that colonialism impedes the progress of the peoples of the colonies and that progress is incompatible with the existence of any form of colonial domination. But in 1959, Wheeler alleged that "the Soviet nationalities policy appears simply as a new and materially more efficient form of colonialism".¹ Seven years later life itself compelled him to make substantial admissions that undermined his own positions. He wrote:

"As regards their (Central Asian peoples—R.T.) material condition there can be no doubt that during the forty years which have elapsed since the formation of the Muslim republics of Central Asia there has been a remarkable advance in public health, industrial productivity, cotton output, communications and the standard of living. In all these matters the Muslim peoples of Soviet Central Asia are far ahead of those of any non-Soviet Muslim country and indeed of any Asian country with the exception of Japan and Israel."² Reluctantly admitting that there is national equality in the USSR Wheeler writes that the Muslims of Central Asia "have good reason to be satisfied with their present material condition"³ and that they accept the existing system of political arrangement.

Then what else is there to talk about? What is perturbing Wheeler, Kajum-Han, Hayit and their ilk? They cannot stomach the fact that specific issues concerning the Soviet Union as a whole have been placed under the jurisdiction of the Union Government; that each republic has its Communist Party; that the citizens of all these republics, whatever their nationality, are also citizens of the Soviet Union, etc. In other words, they are angered by the fact that having voluntarily entered the socialist Soviet federation, the peoples of Central Asia have transferred certain functions to

¹ G. Wheeler, "Soviet Central Asia", *The Muslim World*, October 1966, No. 4, pp. 240-41.

² Ibid.

³ Ibid.

the Union Government which is in a position to discharge them in the most rational way in the interests of each member of the federation and the federation as a whole; and then there is their hatred for the Soviet political and socio-economic system, for the moral and political cohesion of the multinational Soviet people, that is, for all that is the source of the Soviet Union's strength.

Reasoning as they do, they concentrate their efforts on searching for ways to undermine the unity of the Soviet people and weaken the Soviet state. "Since, however, all the countries of the Western bloc regard the Soviet Union as a potential enemy," Wheeler writes, "they are interested in the possibility of nationalism inside the Soviet Union... because they... think that widespread nationalist outbreaks would bring strategic and economic embarrassment to the USSR."¹

Making this cynical admission Wheeler passes over in silence the fact that the "countries of the Western bloc" are not original in this respect. In his time Hitler had set the same task to his propaganda machine and the intelligence service. The nazi leaders failed to achieve it even in the initial, successful period of their aggression against the USSR. All the more unattainable is this objective today, although the imperialist and left-opportunist propaganda have not abandoned their efforts to incite nationalism and shake the mainstays of Soviet society.

How is it that despite their inability to attain their anti-Soviet objectives, the "critics" have been playing a steadily increasing role since the Second World War? This paradox mirrors the successes of socialism, or to be more precise, its development into a world system, an international factor which is having an ever increasing impact on historical development. In conditions of the third stage of the general crisis of capitalism, imperialist propaganda is attaching much greater significance to attacks on the Soviet Government's nationalities policy in Central Asia, because the rise of the world system of socialism has paved the way for the down-

¹ G. Wheeler, *The Modern History of Soviet Central Asia*, London, 1965, pp. 148-49.

fall of colonial empires and the appearance of more than 70 new states on their ruins. The sole example of genuine decolonisation for the population and the leaders of these states, even for those who are grossly prejudiced against socialism, was the implementation of the Marxist-Leninist teaching about the national-colonial question by the Great October Socialist Revolution. This teaching is founded on the following crucial principle: to eliminate oppression of man by man and with it national and racial inequality and oppression in all their forms and manifestations. This was the course taken by the revolutionary proletariat of the centre and the national borderlands of the former tsarist empire and it enabled them to eliminate colonial domination and liberate all the peoples formerly oppressed by tsarism.

Today not only the friends of the USSR talk about the great force of example set the colonial peoples by the October Revolution which liberated the former tsarist Russia's colonies. The *Spectator*, a magazine which can by no means be viewed as progressive, made the following admission in an article about the 50th anniversary of Soviet power: "...the real impact of the Russian Revolution on the outside world began to be felt only when decolonisation and the 'modernisation' of Afro-Asia got under way. How was one to modernise?... After 1917 the new generation of colonial revolutionaries... began to see Russia as their future model."¹

The liberation of the colonies, a process characteristic of the present epoch, is the result of the struggle for liberation of the colonial peoples in conditions of the objective alliance of socialism, the working class of the metropolises and the national liberation movement on an international scale, which is a decisive factor of present-day development.

The first alliance of this kind was formed over half a century ago in Central Asia. There socialism won. The peoples of Central Asia owe all their vast national and international gains to their liberation from colonial domination which they achieved only because of this alliance and self-determination which enabled them to build socialism

¹ *Spectator*, November 3, 1967, p. 527.

and ensure a happy life for all people of labour in the shortest possible space of time.

The propaganda against the socialist system in the Central Asian republics is designed not only to undermine the monolithic unity of the Soviet people and the might of the USSR. In his half-hearted admission concerning the objectives of the current slanderous imperialist propaganda against the Soviet Government's nationalities policy in Central Asia, Wheeler also passes over in silence that it is deliberately discrediting the experience of decolonisation of the Central Asian peoples at a time when colonial empires are crumbling and the former colonial peoples, now the peoples of the Third World, are taking to the road of socio-economic development.

Today this objective has been placed at the top of the list. Its interconnection with the imperialist plans of influencing the life and the future development of the Third World countries predetermines the protracted and diversified nature of the forthcoming attacks. A principled ideological struggle is developing on a world scale around the objective assessment and the propaganda of the international significance of the experience of decolonisation and the building of socialism in Central Asia.

Attacking this experience imperialist "critics" are most concerned with preventing the peoples of the young states from taking the road of non-capitalist development. In effect, this is a stable course in the sphere of neo-colonialist ideology, a policy which imperialism pursues with regard to the economically underdeveloped states in the period of the transition from capitalism to socialism and which is aimed at thwarting their advancement along the socialist path.

"Criticism" of the life of the peoples in the Central Asian socialist republics has become a method of neo-colonialism.

The following principal methods, whose variants can be found in all anti-Soviet writings, are characteristic of this "criticism".

1. To bring accusations of "Russification", "Sovietisation" and "assimilation" against the Soviet Government. This is a device which has become particularly widespread in recent

years. The British demographer and statistician J. A. Newth contrived to produce a diffusive article solely on the basis of the list of people decorated on the occasion of the 25th anniversary of Tajikistan in which he tried to prove that the process of assimilation¹ was in progress in that republic. The anti-Soviet writers often advance this false charge because the young states which have won political independence are anxious to rid themselves of the representatives of the colonial powers holding key positions in their economy and administration. These writers want to convince them that the opposite is allegedly the case in Central Asia.

2. To misrepresent the enormous role played by the Russian people in helping to promote the rapid economic development of the Central Asian republics. If such progress is actually taking place, the "critics" say, it is solely due to the efforts of the Russians who are portrayed as colonisers both in the past and present. This is a way of telling the young states that if they want to make similar progress they should invite the former colonisers or else live in poverty.

3. To lament the alleged lack of freedom to worship Islam and "restriction" of the rights of Muslims. Evidently this falsehood is calculated to impair the prestige of the Soviet Union in the eyes of the peoples of the Muslim East. At the same time talk about religion is designed to play up the bourgeois theory of the unity of peoples and their cultures on the basis of religion rather than on a social and class foundation.

4. To defame the role of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and particularly the Communist Parties of the Union Republics. This is to prompt the leaders of the young states to regard the activities of the Communist Parties in their countries with disfavour.

5. To accuse of "Soviet colonialism". By doing so the "critics" hope to lead the young states of the Third World into believing in the "progressive nature" of the former colonial powers which have allegedly liberated their depen-

¹ J. A. Newth, "The 'Establishment' in Tajikistan", *Soviet Studies*, Oxford, Vol. XIV, No. 7, 1963; Vol. XV, No. 3, 1965.

dencies, while the Soviet Union is retaining its "domination" in Central Asia.

6. To allege that the Central Asian republics have only an "illusory right to secession" and lack the right to genuine self-determination, which is interpreted solely as the right to secession.

F. Ch. Iklé, a US specialist in the strategy of the anti-Soviet foreign policy propaganda, admits the neo-colonialist nature of this anti-Soviet position. A staff member of the notorious RAND Corporation which conducts research into foreign policy problems for the US Government he prompts his government to launch unceasing attacks on "Soviet colonialism" in general, and "colonialism" in Central Asia, in particular. In his book *How Nations Negotiate*¹ he calls upon the Western countries to offset the mounting initiative of the USSR in posing crucial international problems by developing the concept "colonialism". He deplores that Western negotiators "talk and think of 'decolonisation' only in reference to areas in Africa, Asia, or Latin America that have been colonised by a Western country", and very rarely "bring up the... nineteenth-century colonisation by Russia of vast areas in Central Asia". He wants Western diplomats to disregard facts and world public opinion and to pose the question of the existence of "Soviet colonialism" not only in Central Asia, for example, in Uzbekistan, but also in the East European countries.

He does not care that this would be an obvious provocation since no such thing as "Soviet colonialism" exists, either in the Soviet Central Asian republics or in the East European socialist countries. He is concerned only with the result of this anti-Soviet propaganda, a result which, in his opinion, would help the West in its struggle for the minds and hearts of the peoples of the young states. And so Iklé writes for the edification of the Western diplomats:

"Mental associations are formed by repetition. If the West consents to the removal of the Hungarian question from the UN agenda (which has a long and growing list of other

colonial issues) and almost never raises such issues as the fate of the Asian Muslims in Soviet Uzbekistan, it teaches the Afro-Asians to associate 'colonialism' only with those issues in which it is the accused party."¹

Iklé's discourses attract attention not so much because they contain false allegations about the existence of some sort of "Soviet colonialism", or references to the so-called Hungarian question, which, incidentally, has been removed from the UN agenda in view of its undeniable political insolvency and not simply at the kind wish of the United States, but because in them he admits that the question of "Soviet colonialism" is a factor of propagandistic and political significance for imperialism and appeals to make the most of it to keep the young states within imperialism's sphere of influence.

It is significant that the accusations of "colonialism", which are levelled against the Soviet Union in order to undermine the confidence of the developing nations in its nationalities policy, permeate the latest slanderous writings, especially those books which have been published in connection with the 50th anniversary of Soviet power.

The formula "Soviet colonialism" has become the leit-motif of the calumny directed at the nationalities policy of the Communist Party and the Government of the Soviet Union. It has become a weapon in the arsenal of anti-communism, and efforts are being made to draw a parallel between the solution of the national question in the Soviet Union and colonialism as such. This tendency is mirrored even in the titles of a number of books. The first was Kathleen Mary Stahl's *British and Soviet Colonial Systems* published in London in 1950. Another example are books by Walter Kolarz, an Englishman whose notorious anti-Soviet views opened the doors of the BBC before him. After his death in 1962 Western writers said that he "did more than any other individual" to smear the nationalities policy in the USSR, and that his books *Russia and Her Colonies* (London, 1952) and *The Peoples of the Soviet Far East* "have become

¹ F. Ch. Iklé, *How Nations Negotiate*, New York, 1964, p. 240.

¹ Ibid., p. 241.

standard works on the minority peoples of the Soviet Union".¹

There are many more examples of this kind. Slandorous accusations are also made by some leaders of bourgeois governments and states and not infrequently at the UN General Assembly and various international conferences and congresses.

In recent years this flow of fabrications about colonialism allegedly practised by the Soviet Government has been swelled by repeated claims that it tramples upon the right of the Central Asian peoples to self-determination.

The Soviet Government is being accused of conducting a "double-standard policy of advocating self-determination for British, French and other nations' possessions, but denying the same to its own...".² Pipes insists that in practice the Bolsheviks are allegedly against the "right to secession and the formation of independent states".³ Park claims that "by the end of 1920 the Soviet Government had repudiated, in fact if not in principle, its early promise to the nations of Russia of the right to self-determination up to and including secession".⁴

He is echoed by Wheeler who declared that the peoples of Central Asia were denied the right to self-determination.⁵ Hayit keeps referring to the "Kokand Autonomy" as an example of the violation of the principle of self-determination of Muslims.⁶

Even in literary research some authors miss no opportunity to maintain that the peoples of Central Asia have been allegedly deprived of their right to self-determination, as, for example, Allworth does in his book.⁷

¹ E. Crankshaw, *The Foreword to Communism and Colonialism* by W. Kolarz.

² M. Rywkin, *Russia in Central Asia*, New York, London, 1963, pp. 153-54.

³ R. Pipes, *The Formation of the Soviet Union*, New York, 1954, p. 43.

⁴ A. Park, *Bolshevism in Turkestan, 1917-27*, New York, 1957, p. 59.

⁵ G. Wheeler, *Racial Problems in Soviet Muslim Asia*, London, 1959, p. 18.

⁶ B. Hayit, *Esir türkler...*, Ankara, 1966, pp. 20-21.

⁷ E. Allworth, *Uzbek Literary Policy*, The Hague, 1964, p. 57.

The ranks of the "defenders" of the right of the Central Asian peoples to self-determination have been joined by the advocates of the budding neo-colonialism of the FRG, one of whom is Professor B. Meissner.

In 1962, Meissner published two anti-Soviet books. One was about the CPSU Programme¹ and the other about the right of nations to self-determination in the domestic and foreign policy of the Soviet Union. In the latter² he tried to show the "insolvency" of the Soviet concept of self-determination of the peoples, the "departure" of this concept from Lenin's precepts and the "non-conformity" of the Soviet doctrine to practice.

By tendentiously selecting and deliberately misinterpreting facts and manipulating with quotations Meissner hopes to convince the reader that his fabrications are in effect the Soviet point of view. For example, he draws the following conclusion: "It can be said that since the October Revolution the right of the peoples of Russia to self-determination has been diminishing and is being distorted in an imperialist sense. Besides negative development we have the fact that the right to self-determination beginning with Lenin has been an integral part of the foreign policy theory and international-law doctrine."³

Meissner arbitrarily divides the peoples of the Soviet Union into three groups from the point of view of the implementation, or the possibility of implementing the right to self-determination. He calls one group "colonial peoples of Russia" in which a "special place", in his opinion, "is occupied by Transcaucasia and Turkestan".

In an effort to prove that the socialist revolution deprives the peoples of the right to self-determination he declares that the "formation of the Soviet Union followed a course which clearly contradicted the principle of self-determination".⁴ "Since proletarian-socialist interests definitely prevail over national interests, the right to self-determination can,

¹ B. Meissner, *Das Parteiprogramm der KPdSU, 1903-1961*, Köln, 1962.

² B. Meissner, *Sowjetunion und Selbstbestimmungsrecht*, Köln, 1962.

³ Ibid., p. 36.

⁴ Ibid., p. 40.

under communist rule, be turned into its opposite on the pretext of political expediency. Thus, the 'question of right' becomes a question of rule," the author concludes.¹

This "defence" of the principle of self-determination of peoples, which has become a generally recognised principle of international law thanks to the consistent efforts of the Soviet Union, is undertaken by almost all the calumniators of the Soviet nationalities policy.

What is the reason for this? Why have these sworn enemies of self-determination of peoples suddenly decided to pose as staunch champions of self-determination as far as Central Asia is concerned?

Is it not strange that Right-wing bourgeois writers should be supporting a Leninist principle?

The fact of the matter is that colonialism is disintegrating, and in this process the peoples exercise the right to self-determination to acquire state independence. So far this is how this right is understood by many. In the USSR all peoples acquired both national and social freedom. Having acquired state sovereignty the socialist nations entered the federation and vested a part of their functions in the central government and the head of state. At the same time many small nationalities do not have their own states and the imperialist ideologists make much of this fact in their anti-Soviet propaganda. They keep on repeating that the Soviet peoples, including the peoples of Central Asia, are deprived of their inalienable right to self-determination.

Closely interrelated with the question of the "right to self-determination" is the latest thesis of the imperialist propaganda with regard to Soviet Central Asia. First formulated in 1964 by the Englishman Geoffrey Wheeler and then in 1967 by two Frenchmen Bennigsen and Lemerrier-Quelquejay it was later taken up by such US and world "pillars" of anti-Soviet propaganda as Philip Mosely and Zbigniew Brzezinski, directors of social centres in the USA.

Supporting some sort of "widespread view", Geoffrey Wheeler wrote that if "self-determination had been faithfully applied in the Steppe Region and Turkestan, the spirit

¹ B. Meissner, *Sowjetunion und Selbstbestimmungsrecht*, p. 27.

of nationalism which the Revolution undoubtedly evoked would eventually have resulted in the formation of one or more Muslim states. These might have preferred association with the rest of the Muslim world rather than with a Communist or any other kind of Russia".¹

French Sovietologists were even more frank in voicing the hope that the expansion of the Soviet Union's contacts with the Muslim East would subsequently enable the Central Asian republics to fall away from the USSR and merge with other Muslim states on the basis of the "resurgence of the notions propagated in his day by Sultan Galiyev, and in particular that of building a Muslim socialism without the Russians".²

In the light of the vigorously expanding and deepening friendly relations between the USSR and the countries of the Middle East, this idea, judging by everything, has been welcomed by the most notorious anti-Soviet elements overseas.

Indulging in wishful thinking Philip Mosely wrote in an article entitled "The Soviet Search for Security" that the emergence of "communist regimes" in the Middle East which have close ties with the Soviet Union will result in the Central Asian republics breaking away from the USSR. "A large confederation of basically Muslim tradition might come to exert a considerable influence among the nearly thirty million people of Muslim background within the Soviet Republics of Azerbaijan, Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan and Tajikistan. The emergence of a large new centre of attraction to the south of Soviet Central Asia could conceivably upset the balance of social and political forces there, with potentially serious disadvantages to the Soviet state and its prestige."³

¹ G. Wheeler, *The Modern History of Soviet Central Asia*, London, 1965, p. 115.

² A. Bennigsen and Ch. Lemerrier-Quelquejay, *Islam in the Soviet Union*, London, 1967, p. 228.

³ Ph. E. Mosely, "The Soviet Search for Security", *Soviet-American Rivalry in the Middle East* (ed. by J. C. Haurewitz), New York-Washington-London, 1969, p. 219; also *The Times of India*, February 25, 1970.

For several years now Zbigniew Brzezinski has been harping on a "crisis in the nationalities question" in the USSR and complaining that the majority of Western specialists have been ignoring this. In his opinion this crisis has been caused by the mounting demand of the population, particularly the intelligentsia of the national republics, for "greater autonomy",¹ "a larger share in Soviet decision-making; a bigger part of the economic pie",² the "militant revival along nationalistic or ideological lines".³ He believes that there will be no formal disintegration of the USSR, but hopes that it will take place in substance.

Such is the logical end of the evolution of the positions of our "critics" and one that fully discloses their actual hopes.

But before presenting the actual picture and using facts to overturn this "criticism" let us take a look at who pays these "criticisms" and what sort of people they are.

¹ Z. Brzezinski, "Five Years after Khrushchev", *Problems of Communism*, January-February 1968, p. 40.

² Z. Brzezinski, "The Soviet Future", *The Times of India*, March 4, 1970.

³ Z. Brzezinski, Interview by *U.S. News & World Report*, April 20, 1970, p. 72.

3. THE "CRITICS": WHO ARE THEY?

Since the ancient Romans, the principle of *qui prodest* has been broadly applied in law and politics. Indeed, who benefits by spreading this calumny? Who is behind those agencies and writers who have made the slander of the life of the Central Asian peoples their occupation? Who pays them and gives orders?

To answer these questions we shall have to examine some of these agencies and the biographies of some of the calumniators. But first a few more general remarks about the anti-Soviet propaganda and ideology policy conducted by modern imperialism.

In recent years this policy has been sharply invigorated. The principal reason is the mounting prestige, the growing might and increasing influence and possibilities of socialism in general, and primarily of the Soviet Union. In its global competition with and its struggle against imperialism socialism is gaining more and more victories.

The gains of socialism and the propagandistic attacks and slander directed against it have always been in direct proportional dependence.

The dynamic development, the all-conquering strength and unprecedented possibilities of the new society which is being created on the basis of the harmonious scientific theory of Marxism-Leninism have ensured an unparalleled and ever growing influence of this theory on the minds of the people throughout the world.

The late US Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, an advocate of the tough policy from positions of strength towards the socialist countries, had to admit that the USA had spent thousands of millions of dollars in preparation for a possible war of bombs, aircraft and guns, but too little on a war of ideas in which it had been suffering reverses which no military might could offset.

Consistently stepping up the cold war which it started in 1946, imperialism has raised it to the level of official policy.

Anti-communism, that is, the aggregate of methods, acts and ideological trends designed to discredit the theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism, likewise began to gain momentum. In 1961, a bill authorising the introduction of a course in anti-communism at schools was passed in one of the US states. It was the first bill of this kind to be adopted both in the United States itself and in the world.

The last quarter of a century has witnessed the rapid spread of anti-Sovietism, that is the aggregate of methods, acts and ideological trends designed to discredit the theory and practice of communist construction in the Soviet Union.

Some of the humanities taught in the bourgeois world have jointly produced a new branch—Sovietology. Its citadel is the USA. But it also has strongpoints in Britain, the FRG, France and certain other countries.

In 1970, over 150 "research institutes" and about 200 university departments in the United States were engaged in Sovietology and in planning ideological subversion against socialism. A number of universities (Columbia, Yale, Pennsylvania, Stanford, Georgetown and others) sprouted diverse "institutes", "schools" and "centres" of Sovietology. In effect these agencies comprise what the Americans call "scientific and propaganda pools" (patterned after "scientific and industrial pools").

The biggest is Columbia University which operates such major Sovietology centres as the Russian Institute headed by Marshall D. Shulman, the East European Institute headed by Philip Mosely, and finally, the recently established Institute on Communist Affairs which is headed by the most prominent "authority" on anti-communism Zbigniew Brzezinski.

It would be naïve to think that these "scientific and propaganda pools" are engaged solely in working out propaganda methods and collecting the necessary material. They are also secretly working for the major monopolies and the US Government fulfilling their confidential orders meeting their current and future needs.

Nevertheless it is clear that basically their activity is designed to promote the objectives of the ideological struggle. They are endeavouring to misrepresent socialist reality, undermine and discredit the Marxist teaching, work out the methods and means of achieving their goals, and so forth.

They have a large printing industry and the mass media at their disposal. In 1970, the USA spent more than \$500 million on the ideological struggle and anti-communist propaganda. A part of this sum went to finance the propaganda centres.

Jointly with the State Department, the CIA, the Pentagon, the USIA, the Peace Corps and other government agencies engaged in anti-Soviet propaganda, these centres have become a part of the anti-communist machinery operated by US imperialism.

To a lesser degree this applies to a number of other advanced capitalist countries. Their foreign policy propaganda has become one of the basic functions of the state and an element of this policy. Moreover, the imperialist countries are now co-ordinating and pooling their efforts in this field.

Let us return to Central Asia. Slander about it has become an important element of anti-Sovietism and anti-communism; the propaganda for and about the peoples living in that part of the USSR is both written and verbal.

In recent years the United States has published the bulk of the "studies" about Central Asia. Dozens of US universities are conducting either direct or indirect "research" into the life of the Central Asian republics. Interest in Central Asia is even displayed by such an anti-communist organisation as the Institute on Communist Affairs, whose director Zbigniew Brzezinski more than once aired his thoughts about the future of that part of the USSR.

The central operational organisation disseminating verbal slander against Central Asia and its peoples is Radio Liberty in Munich (in Bogenhausen). It was established on March 7, 1951 on the initiative of the CIA.

Headed by former Assistant Secretary of State Howland H. Sargeant, the Radio Liberty Committee has its headquarters in New York. With 17 transmitters totalling 1,840,000 watts at its disposal, Radio Liberty weekly beams 2,000 hours to the Soviet Union broadcasting in 18 languages of the Soviet peoples.

The station has a staff of 500 and is run by an American Kenneth Scott. Several hours a day it broadcasts to Central Asia in Uzbek, Turkmenian, Tajik, Kirghiz, Kara-Kalpak and Uighur, the principal languages of that part of the USSR.

Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty employ a large number of traitors, people who at one time or another fled to the West from the socialist countries, and all key posts are held by US intelligence officers.

Radio Liberty draws on the services of the München Institute for the Study of the USSR, a large Sovietological "research" centre. Since 1951, it has been organising conferences, including international conferences, issuing various brochures, books and accounts of its conferences, publishing (or has done so in the past) regular publications in English, and in the Russian, Ukrainian, Byelorussian and Central Turkic languages.¹ There are two sides to the Institute's activity. One is secret—analysis of the situation in the USSR and other European socialist countries with a view to drawing up recommendations for activity against them in diverse fields. The other is the printing of various publications and preparation of materials for Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty designed to undermine the prestige of the USSR, and the influence of Marxist ideas and the example of socialism. The Institute's authors—opponents in the USSR—are on its files.

The Institute's Central Asia and Kazakhstan department compiles materials for programmes "on the Soviet history

¹ The *Bulletin* of the München Institute for the Study of the USSR, No. 12, 1969.

of Turkestan" and other themes, which are included in Radio Liberty's daily broadcasts beamed in the languages of the Central Asian peoples.

The CIA founded the Institute in 1950, and in 1970, its annual budget exceeded DM 5,000,000 which were provided by the CIA.

In its propaganda for and about Central Asia, Radio Liberty sometimes draws on the materials supplied by another, British source. It is the Central Asian Research Centre of St. Antony's College in Oxford. The Centre puts out books and until 1968 it published the quarterly *Central Asian Review*. This publication was subsequently merged with the *Mizan Letter* and now appears under the name of *Mizan*.

What sort of a "scientific" establishment is this Centre? Here is a summary of a document which found its way into the press in 1970.

The Central Asian Research Centre is an establishment operating with the support of and under the control of the British intelligence. Founded in 1951 it has been functioning ostensibly as an ordinary research organisation, a branch of St. Antony's College. Apart from the Centre's director Colonel G. Wheeler, and the secretary who are both SIS officers, not a single member of this organisation knows of its association with the British intelligence.

The document further states that the Centre's main task is to study the political and cultural development of six Soviet republics (Azerbaijan, Turkmenia, Uzbekistan, Tajikistan, Kirghizia and Kazakhstan) with a Muslim population and also to study Soviet publications dealing with neighbouring Iran, Afghanistan and India, and that the results of these studies are to be published in the quarterly *Central Asian Review* put out by the Central Asian Research Centre.

The Centre, it is pointed out, likewise studies other problems of Soviet Central Asia, for example, the compilation of the grammar of the main Turkic languages which are published when it is considered necessary.

The Centre's output, the document states, is used by the SPA (special political activity of the British intelligence—

R.T.) and by the Foreign Office research department for propaganda purposes.

The document notes that the Centre's director is responsible to deputy chief of the SIS with whom he maintains contact through the SPA. Constant control over the Centre's activity is entrusted to Section SPA/4 (the section of the department of special political and ideological activities of the British intelligence engaged in ideological subversion against the USSR and other socialist countries—R.T.), which is simultaneously a liaison body between the Centre and other subdivisions of the SIS. All correspondence of the Central Asian Research Centre passes through the SPA/4.

All subdivisions of the central apparatus of the SIS are recommended to bear in mind that the director of the Central Asian Research Centre is directly concerned with obtaining any information about Soviet Central Asia and that consequently all pertinent materials should be directed to the SPA/4 for transference to the Centre. The Central Asian Research Centre has a large number of studies about Central Asia which may be used for any purposes.

We should like to add that the above is a summary of document 190/58 drawn up by the British intelligence.

Should we divide the modern Sovietologists (anti-Communists) according to countries and nationalities, we would discover that each group has some persons who are more energetic in their efforts than the others to move into the forefront in this unseemly activity.

In the FRG, for example, it is Boris Meissner who strives to play the role of leader. Now, who is he?

Usually Meissner says that he has become a "specialist in Soviet affairs" because he had once been on the staff of the FRG Embassy in the USSR. Actually, however, his practical activity in the Soviet Union was by no means as innocent as he makes it out to be. This fact was brought to light at the 90-day open trial of five traitors in 1970, which was held in the courtroom of the Tribunal of the Leningrad Military District.

The world knows about the 900-day siege of Leningrad, the cradle of the October Socialist Revolution, and the heroism of its inhabitants. In those days the special GFP-

520 detachment, which was formed by the nazis to fight against the patriots on occupied Soviet territory, was operating in Leningrad Region. Some of its men have so far managed to escape punishment. Two of its leaders responsible for murdering and torturing their compatriots, including old people and children, and also French and Danish patriots are at present living in Canada (Ivan Polygalin lives in Montreal under the name of Orlov, and Arthur Svetlovsky, former non-commissioned officer, is in Toronto).

The Gestapo and the SD recruited people who could prove useful in organising the annihilation of Slavs by Slavs, Turkis by Turkis, French by French, and so forth.

In the Leningrad Region the man in charge of this work was Sturmbahnführer SS von Wakerbart, Chief of Section I-C of the German 18th Army's HQ.

Von Wakerbart's deputy, Boris Meissner, was among those who escaped punishment. Today he is on the directorate of the Bundesinstitut zur Erforschung des Marxismus-Leninismus in Cologne and a professor of Kiel and Cologne universities. His students have probably heard about the political views of their "instructor", Professor B. A. Meissner, who lays claim to being the leading authority on the Soviet Union and other socialist countries in the Federal Republic of Germany, all the more so since he makes no effort to conceal his convictions, and crudely distorts history in his anti-Soviet articles. His students and colleagues would certainly be surprised to discover that this handsome, polite man with grey hair and mild manners is not only a theoretician of anti-Sovietism, but also a practised torturer and killer of Soviet citizens in the Second World War.

Meissner personally participated in punitive expeditions. His brutality was notorious. He ordered his subordinates to torture and kill people on the slightest suspicion and to leave no witnesses. "The dead don't bite," he used to say.

He was a fanatical nazi who admired Hitler and the nazi "new order". A witness at the trial of the traitors in Leningrad testified that after the rout of nazi Germany, Meissner tried to raise the spirits of one of his fellow Feldpolizei by prophesying another war against the Soviet Union in five

or six years. "Such people as you and I," he said, "will be needed by any rule and government except communist."

The reactionary, revenge-seeking circles in West Germany noticed Meissner. They sheltered him after the war, and managed to keep him out of court, although the International Military Tribunal in Nuremberg ruled that the SD was a criminal organisation. Meissner began to get along in life: he was given a chair at Kiel University and eventually became a leading figure in the sphere of anti-Soviet activities, a specialist in subversive actions against the socialist countries.

A wide field for action opened before Meissner in the Ostforschung, a ramified network of over 100 organisations and institutes in the FRG engaged in combating "communism in the spiritual sphere". The Ostforschung staff gathers intelligence information about the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, and prepares anti-Soviet and anti-communist articles for newspapers and magazines.

Subtle slander directed at the socialist countries, distortion of the aims and tasks of the Communist Parties and malicious misrepresentation of the principles of Marxism-Leninism are the favourite methods of West German Sovietologists. Boris Meissner is one of the most active among them. He always strives to keep "in step with the times" and adjusts his subversive activity to the current tasks in the interests of the extreme revanchist circles in the Federal Republic of Germany.

In his books and articles, this man, a war criminal of the period of the Second World War and a war-monger today, professes to be "concerned" about human rights in the USSR, about the self-determination of the peoples of the Soviet Baltic Area and Central Asia.

Let us now take a look at Mustafa Chokayev, who was the first to launch an "organised" attack in monographs and articles against the nationalities policy of the CPSU in Central Asia. Mustafa Chokayev had once been the head of the so-called Kokand Autonomous Government which existed for a few months in 1917 and 1918 in a town in the Fergliana Valley. It was a "government" which, according even to people entertaining anti-Soviet views, "had no real ties with

the general population".¹ A bourgeois nationalist, he pandered to the interests of the united counter-revolutionary forces of the Russian capitalists, local exploiters and the British in return for their support. After his so-called army, which was under the command of the criminal Irgash, had been routed, Chokayev sought refuge with the white Cossacks and the interventionists and then made his way to Paris. There he published his two books mentioned earlier in this work.

Towards the end of the twenties, Chokayev moved to Berlin where, in 1929, being an avowed enemy of the Soviet Union, he was given permission to launch the Turkic-language magazine *Yash Türkistan*. When Hitler came to power the nazis took an interest in his activity.

The last issue of this magazine was published in 1939, the year of the signing of the Soviet-German Non-Aggression Pact. But its closure by the nazis was merely a gesture connected not so much with the conclusion of the Pact as with their need for a person who would not only profess Pan-Turkic views but who would also share their own views and do their bidding. Such a man was Chokayev to whom they assigned a special role as they prepared for war against the USSR.

Having launched the war against the USSR, the nazis formed what was called the Unity Committee of National Turkestan for the purpose of conducting extensive subversive activity against Soviet power. Its job was to promote printed and verbal propaganda, recruit agents from among the Soviet prisoners of war of Turkic origin and form military units out of them. Chokayev was made president of the committee.

But he did not live up to the expectations of his new masters. Taking advantage of the intrigues which were rife among the traitors the nazis got rid of him. Chokayev was poisoned in 1942. His place was taken by Vali Kajum-Han, a traitor who had fled his country and whose right-hand man to this day is Baymirza Hayit.

Hayit writes about Central Asia. He is the author of about a dozen books and a number of other publications in the

¹ E. Allworth, *Central Asia. A Century of Russian Rule*, New York-London, 1967, p. 228.

German, English, Turkish and Arabic languages. He especially suited his masters because he was an Uzbek, a factor which played a very significant role in his career. Here is his biography which was published in the Soviet Union.

Baymirza Hayit was born and educated in Soviet Uzbekistan. There he became a teacher. When the Great Patriotic War broke out several months later, he was mobilised and sent to the front where soon afterwards he was taken prisoner. It was then that the "teacher" disclosed his true "talents". In contrast to the majority of Soviet prisoners of war who preferred concentration camps and prison cells rather than serve the nazi invaders, Hayit agreed to work for the Gestapo. His zeal in the performance of his duties attracted attention and on instructions from high nazi circles he was sent to a school for spies and saboteurs where he demonstrated his special "gifts". He voluntarily disseminated nazi ideas among the other trainees and summoned them to serve Hitler. Upon leaving the school he was enlisted in Sonderkommand SS and for "exemplary conduct" was given a job in an intelligence agency called Zeppelin in Berlin.

His fawning diligence pleased the nazi generals, and it was not long before he was appointed head of a military section and made vice-president of the so-called Unity Committee of National Turkestan. The committee's political work was supervised by nazi intelligence, while strictly intelligence operations were carried out under the guidance of Türkoststelle Department headed by Hauptsturmführer SS Doctor Raine Oltzsche of the Chief Administration SS-SD. Hayit's obvious loyalty rapidly won him the fullest confidence of his superiors in this top secret organisation. The road for his career was now open. He travelled from one spy and saboteur training centre to another, lecturing and instructing future spies, preaching nazism and inciting hatred for the Soviet Union and the other countries of the anti-Hitler coalition.

He was very active in recruiting prisoners of war into the SS East Muslim Division, the Timur Battalion and the Turkestan Legion which the nazis tried to form out of traitors.

Yet even in such difficult conditions true Soviet patriots remained loyal to their people and their country. For exam-

ple, after agreeing to serve with the Turkestan Legion a Kazakh prisoner of war, Bakita Baizhanov of the Soviet frontier forces, made a point of getting himself promoted to platoon commander. He built up an underground patriotic organisation, contacted the partisans, regularly listened to Sovinformbureau radio bulletins, received Soviet leaflets and conducted propaganda among the men of the legion. During the Red Army's December offensive in the Don Area, 193 legionnaires, mostly Kazakhs and Uzbeks, mutinied under the influence of Baizhanov's organisation and turned against the Germans. Unfortunately, the Gestapo arrested Baizhanov on the eve of the mutiny and executed him in a prison in Boguchar. He was brutally tortured before his death but did not disclose the names of his comrades.¹

As regards Hayit, he deliberately chose the road of treason and the Germans valued him only as a traitor. Most probably they despised him, but they needed him because he was a traitor.

His next promotion put him in command of the legionnaires who together with the SS forces participated in anti-partisan operations in the Soviet Union, France, Italy and Czechoslovakia. In the Ukraine, Byelorussia and in the Oryol and Bryansk regions Hayit and his cutthroats shot, murdered and committed other acts of violence. They took part in crushing the Warsaw uprising in 1944, and turned six villages near Toulouse into heaps of ashes and rubble. According to the testimony of numerous witnesses, Hayit personally killed hundreds of innocent people, including Muslims. For example, Dzhumabek Akbergenov, a member of the Schmidt punitive detachment testified that Hayit personally ordered the annihilation of those who disobeyed the nazis. In July 1943, 30 men of the Turkestan Legion who came out against the nazis were burned alive on his order. The nazis hanged the tankman Kenzhebekov and Doctor Sadykov and twenty of their comrades whom Hayit had denounced. People who would not turn traitor met a terrible death at the hands of Baymirza Hayit.

¹ See: *Chekisty*, Moscow, 1970, p. 325 (in Russian).

Following nazi Germany's defeat in 1945 Hayit sought refuge in the British occupation zone in Germany after an unsuccessful attempt to flee to Turkey. Changing into civilian clothes Hayit continued to serve his country's enemies. In recognition of his past "services" Hayit shortly got a doctorate in the history of the East and became actively involved in the activity of West German propaganda centres.

Speaking of Hayit's criminal activity it is necessary to mention his assignments in Turkey, Pakistan and Afghanistan. While still in the service of the nazis he established close relations with another traitor Vali Kajum-Han who later became his "spiritual" mentor, "president" of the Unity Committee of National Turkestan and editor of *Milli Türkistan* magazine, each number of which has articles written by these traitors. Having settled down in Munich, these champions of "freedom, law and order" dream of building up a revanchist war machine and of translating into reality the hopes of their present-day American masters. Not at all squeamish, their new masters disregard the fact that at the height of the Second World War the Wehrmacht Hauptman Hayit was awarded a nazi order for his activity against the Allies, that his well-cared-for hands are stained with the blood of Italian, French, Greek, Yugoslav, Russian, Byelorussian, Ukrainian and Polish patriots and of his deceived compatriots—Uzbeks, Kazakhs, Kirghizes and Turkmenians. They have chosen to forget that in 1944 the *Milli Türkistan* (No. 45) published Hayit's maxim that "the enemies of our friend Germany are our enemies".

This does not bother them in the least. All that matters is that he is prepared to serve them just as zealously as he had served Hitler over a quarter of a century ago.

Such are the "critics", those who seek to benefit by their activity.

One of the top officials of the US propaganda machine, Chairman of the Political Information Committee General Jackson once cynically commented that it is not the truth that is needed in the ideological struggle against communism, but subversion. In that war, he said, we shall need all the cutthroats and gangsters whom we manage to enlist in one way or another. What has been said above about the

imperialist propaganda agencies and writers shows that the general knew what he was talking about.

Elaborating on Jackson's views, head of Radio Free Europe Ernest Langendorf said that when at war one should lie and cheat but should not be caught doing so. . . . It is necessary to take care that the person whom you would want to influence should be unable to discover the falsity of your statements which could be checked on the spot.

Above we have quoted the utterances of people who engage in vicious propaganda about the Soviet Government's nationalities policy in Central Asia. We shall now try to show that Langendorf, Jackson and their ilk have no use for the truth and that they are solely concerned with subversive activity and lies.

4. MARXISM-LENINISM ON THE INTERRELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE STRUGGLE FOR NATIONAL LIBERATION AND SOCIAL EMANCIPATION

In its treatment of the national question Marxism, as the ideology of the proletariat, has always proceeded from the class interests of the working class, and in doing so it analysed and generalised the objective laws of the development of the national liberation movement. By taking these factors into account Marxism was able to create and develop a comprehensive theory of national liberation. Lenin played a tremendous role in elaborating this question. He based his theory on the works of Marx and Engels and on an analysis of the experience of the working-class and national movements. Calumniators often quote him, but solely for the purpose of vilifying the theory and practice of Marxism by counterposing falsified historical "facts" to his views in the hope of driving a wedge between socialism and the national liberation movement.

Marxism's first general ideas on the national question were set forth in 1848 in the *Manifesto of the Communist Party*. They showed that the concepts "nation" and "national" were products of the era of the rise of capitalism and were closely connected with the division of society into two basic classes, the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, and the class struggle. The abolition of national oppression depends on the outcome of this struggle, inasmuch as national oppression is a manifestation of the class domination of the bourgeoisie. Having appeared together with the rise and consolidation of bourgeois relations of production, national oppression disappears as these relations are abolished.

The overthrow of the bourgeoisie paves the way for a drawing together of nations. "In proportion as the exploitation of one individual by another is put an end to, the exploitation of one nation by another will also be put an end to. In proportion as the antagonism between classes within the nation vanishes, the hostility of one nation to another will come to an end."¹

To win this historical struggle between the two classes, the proletariat, which initially is the intra-national antipode of the bourgeoisie, is forced and is obliged to counterpose the international unity of labour of the working class to the international class alliance of capital.

From the very outset Marxism proceeded from the law of social development according to which the decisive role in the relation between "national" and "class" *objectively* belongs to the latter and in this sense the former is subjected to it.

With the due regard for the growth of the European national liberation movement and the deepening of class contradictions between the bourgeoisie and the working class in the middle of the 19th century, Marx further developed the general ideas, set forth in the *Manifesto of the Communist Party*. Studying the problem of the national liberation movement in Ireland in the light of the struggle of the British working class against their own bourgeoisie, Marx arrived at the conclusion that the international alliance of the working class and consequently their own social emancipation were impossible without first demolishing the wall of enmity and isolation between nations, which had been continuously created by the bourgeoisie. "Any nation that oppresses another forges its own chains,"² Marx wrote on March 28, 1870. In a letter to S. Meyer and A. Vogt of April 9, 1870 he noted that the working class of Britain was "divided into two hostile camps, English proletarians and Irish proletarians"³ and underlined that it was particularly important "to awaken a consciousness in the English workers that *for them* the national emancipation of Ireland is no question of abstract

¹ K. Marx, F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Moscow, 1969, Vol. 1, p. 125.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. 2, p. 176.

³ K. Marx, F. Engels, *Selected Correspondence*, Moscow, 1956, p. 286.

justice or humanitarian sentiment but *the first condition of their own social emancipation*.¹ In other words it was a question of the right of nations to self-determination.

In contrast to the bourgeois formulation of the question, Marx regarded national self-determination first as a slogan of the working class and, second, as one of the most important conditions ensuring the international class alliance of the workers essential for the victory over their class enemy—the bourgeoisie.

This Marxist premise enabled Engels in a letter to K. Kautsky written 12 years later on September 12, 1882, to say in reference to the future, that “the victorious proletariat can force no blessings of any kind upon any foreign nation without undermining its own victory by so doing.”²

After Marx and Engels, who had formulated only the general premises for elaborating the problem, Lenin, living in totally different historical conditions, drew up a profoundly scientific programme for solving the national-colonial question in the era of imperialism and proletarian revolutions.

At the turn of the century he was the first to perceive, predict and theoretically substantiate the role and significance of the future national liberation movements of the peoples of the backward countries for the development of democracy and the victory of socialism and their interconnection with the working class's struggle for socialism. Lenin evolved this programme at a time when only the first faint tremors of the future powerful national liberation revolutions were just beginning to be felt. This was at a time when imperialism was confident of the perpetuity of its colonial rule over two-thirds of the world's population.

Elaborating on the Marxist theory in the new historical conditions Lenin showed that as capitalism moves into a new stage the national question develops into a most acute international socio-political issue of the abolition of national-colonial oppression.

He proved that the colonial system of imperialism would inevitably collapse.

¹ K. Marx, F. Engels, *Selected Correspondence*, p. 287.

² *Ibid.*, p. 423.

In his works Lenin traces three objective laws of development of the modern national liberation movement.

The national liberation movement is inviolably linked in its development with the working class's struggle for socialism. Lenin always regarded the national liberation movement as being directly connected with the struggle of the working people against capital, for socialism. The imperialist policy of oppression and the national distrust and enmity which it cultivated among peoples impeded the international drawing together of the working people and the development of democracy. Moreover, imperialism intensified class and national oppression.

“We must *link* the revolutionary struggle for socialism with a revolutionary programme on the national question,” Lenin wrote. “... We must *combine* the revolutionary struggle against capitalism with a revolutionary programme and tactics on all democratic demands. . . .”¹

As early as in the first years following the establishment of a Social-Democratic Party in Russia (in 1895-96), Lenin proposed to include a special point on the national question into its programme. This was done in 1903 at the Second Congress of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party (RSDLP). It was recorded in the programme that the RSDLP considered that its immediate task was to replace the autocracy by a democratic republic whose constitution would guarantee “the right to self-determination for all nations making up the state”. The nations would have the right to secede from other national groups and establish independent national states.

By recognising, upholding and propagandising the right of nations to self-determination, the Marxists upheld the equality and the sovereignty of nations, rejected imposed ties, fought against any state privileges for any nation and educated the working people in the spirit of international solidarity.

Lenin's approach to the national question was just as creative as his approach to the entire theory of socialist revolution. He advised people not to be afraid to predict the

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 21, p. 408.

future and boldly to work for the realisation of theoretical conclusions.

As the national liberation movement in the Asian countries gained momentum, particularly during the First World War, Lenin advanced the principle of national self-determination in a manner totally differing from the way it had been posed in 1895 or 1905. In 1916, he wrote that "the demand for democracy must not be considered in isolation but on a European—today we should say on a world—scale. . . . The several demands of democracy, including self-determination, are not an absolute, but only a *small part* of the general-democratic (now: general-socialist) *world* movement."¹

Substantiating the demand for the liberation of all colonial nations, Lenin pointed out that such a demand "is obviously meaningless *unless* it is accompanied by a series of revolutions in *all* the advanced countries. Moreover, it cannot be accomplished without a successful *socialist* revolution".²

The question of the liberation of colonial and dependent peoples was thus placed in direct dependence on the victory of the working class in its struggle for socialism.

Lenin indicated that a socialist revolution for the overthrow of capital and the emancipation of the working people "will not be solely, or chiefly, a struggle of the revolutionary proletarians in each country against their bourgeoisie—no, it will be a struggle of all the imperialist-oppressed colonies and countries, of all dependent countries, against international imperialism . . . the civil war of the working people against the imperialists and exploiters in all the advanced countries is beginning to be combined with national wars against international imperialism".³

In this sense Lenin did not object to using the slogan: "Workers of all countries and all oppressed peoples, unite!"⁴

In its turn socialist revolution in any country, according to Lenin's emphatic assertion, cannot be lasting if it does not consolidate its unity with national liberation movements.⁵

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 22, p. 341.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. 21, p. 292.

³ *Ibid.*, Vol. 30, p. 159.

⁴ *Ibid.*, Vol. 31, p. 453.

⁵ *Ibid.*, Vol. 23, p. 67.

Imperialist-oppressed peoples who are fighting for their liberation are objectively the allies of the working class in the struggle against imperialism.

Observing the signs of an approaching powerful upsurge of the revolutionary liberation struggle in the East, Lenin wrote: "The period of the awakening of the East in the contemporary revolution is being succeeded by a period in which all the Eastern peoples will participate in deciding the destiny of the whole world so as not to be simply objects of the enrichment of others. The peoples of the East are becoming alive to the need for practical action, the need for every nation to take part in shaping the destiny of all mankind."¹ Admonishing those who did not believe in the future of the national liberation movement, Lenin pointed out in 1921: ". . . Millions and hundreds of millions, in fact the overwhelming majority of the population of the globe, are now coming forward as independent, active and revolutionary factors. It is perfectly clear that in the impending decisive battles in the world revolution, the movement of the majority of the population of the globe, initially directed towards national liberation, will turn against capitalism and imperialism and will, perhaps, play a much more revolutionary part than we expect."²

Lenin worked for a firm alliance of the forces fighting for socialism and the forces of the national liberation movement. He viewed it as an alliance of the proletariat of the advanced countries and of the whole world with the peasantry of the agrarian, backward colonies. Addressing the Communists of the East in 1919, he said: "You must find specific forms for this alliance of the foremost proletarians of the world with the labouring and exploited masses of the East whose conditions are in many cases medieval. We have accomplished on a small scale in our country what you will do on a big scale and in big countries."³

The leader of the proletariat was especially concerned that the national liberation movement should not break away from

¹ *Ibid.*, Vol. 30, p. 160.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. 32, pp. 481-82.

³ *Ibid.*, Vol. 30, p. 161.

the international struggle of the working class for socialism. He noted that like the Proudhonists, who did not believe in the possibility of such a combination, their followers "are now falling into the same error, failing to realise that the merging of proletarian uprisings in large, great imperialist powers with national uprisings and wars of small nations and colonies against the great powers is possible (and inevitable)."¹

For a national liberation movement to be successful it should rely on the support of countries where the socialist revolution has won. Lenin always paid particular attention to the attitude of the proletariat of the metropolitan countries to the national liberation movement in the colonies, and, after the October Revolution, to the nature of the relations between the socialist countries and the peoples fighting for their independence against the colonial yoke. Lenin wrote that "the Bolsheviks are establishing completely different international relations which make it possible for all oppressed peoples to rid themselves of the imperialist yoke".²

Elucidating the Marxist approach to the national liberation movements, he indicated that to strive for the emancipation of the working class from capitalist oppression and to uphold the world fraternity of the workers meant to struggle against any and all oppression and inequality of peoples and nations. He held that it was the duty of the Communists to fight for the liberation of the enslaved peoples, to build relations with them on the basis of a free alliance, and not to confine themselves to "the bare, formal, purely declaratory and actually non-committal recognition of the equality of nations to which the bourgeois democrats confine themselves".³ The policy of the Bolsheviks both before and after the October Revolution has been fully in keeping with this course that Lenin had theoretically substantiated.

As early as in 1912, at the Sixth Conference of the RSDLP, the Bolsheviks adopted two special resolutions, "On the Russian Government's Attack on Persia" and "On the Chinese

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Complete Collection of Works*, Vol. 54, p. 476 (in Russian).

² V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 477.

³ Ibid., p. 147.

Revolution", in which they voiced their solidarity with the struggle of the Iranian and Chinese peoples.

On the day after the establishment of the socialist state, the Soviet Government headed by Lenin promulgated the historical *Decree on Peace*.

Lenin showed the need for the working class, both fighting for power and already possessing it to render all possible assistance to the backward countries. "We shall exert every effort," he wrote in 1916, "to foster association and merger with the Mongolians, Persians, Indians, Egyptians. We believe it is our duty and in our interest to do this, for otherwise socialism in Europe will not be secure." He also pointed out that the country of the victorious socialist revolution would have to "help them pass to the use of machinery, to the lightening of labour, to democracy, to socialism".⁴

In the summer of 1920, Lenin said that "all Communist Parties should render direct aid to the revolutionary movements" in dependencies and colonies.

Yet Lenin sharply opposed any imposition of aid or support. Elucidating Engels's words that the proletariat should not force any blessings upon any foreign nation, he wrote that "an economic revolution will be a stimulus to all peoples to strive for socialism", but that did not mean, however, that the other peoples would immediately and necessarily accept the ideas and emulate the experience of socialism. "Politics will inevitably adapt themselves to the economy, but not immediately or smoothly, not simply, not directly."⁵ He noted on many occasions that in relations with other nations their sympathies, alliance and support should be won "without imposing . . . friendship upon them, but striving to win their friendship by treating them as an equal, as an ally and brother".⁶

Underscoring that the success of the national liberation movement of the colonial peoples depends on the successes and the consolidation of the socialist state, Lenin wrote in 1919 that the "revolutionary movement of the peoples of the

⁴ Ibid., Vol. 23, p. 67.

⁵ Ibid., Vol. 31, p. 148.

⁶ Ibid., Vol. 22, pp. 352-53.

⁷ Ibid., Vol. 25, p. 92.

East can now develop effectively, can reach a successful issue, only in direct association with the revolutionary struggle of our Soviet Republic against international imperialism".¹

The policy of the Soviet Government towards dependent and colonial countries, including assistance and support, has always had only one objective—to promote the consolidation of their political and economic positions against imperialism, promote their social progress and living standards and the strengthening of peace.

The achievement of national liberation inevitably leads to an intensification of the internal class struggle. The struggle for national independence and the liberation of the peoples from colonial oppression extend the sphere and the potentialities of political democracy both within the liberated countries and on an international scale. This is fully in accord with one of the principal propositions of Lenin's theory on the national-colonial question, namely that the aim of the Marxists is to break down the wall of distrust and enmity artificially created over the centuries between the peoples, to bring them closer together and to create and consolidate the fraternal solidarity and co-operation between them in the interests of peace and the most painless and rapid development of mankind in democratic conditions towards socialism and communism.

Lenin, however, laid particular emphasis on the fact that the national liberation movement is bourgeois-democratic and not socialist in character, for it is aimed at solving the tasks of the anti-imperialist and anti-feudal struggle. He noted the "need for a determined struggle against attempts to give a communist colouring to bourgeois-democratic liberation trends in the backward countries. . .".²

The working-class and the Communists support the national bourgeoisie solely because they have common anti-imperialist and anti-feudal tasks which are of a general national character, and it was Lenin alone who demanded that the alliance with the "bourgeois-democracy of the colonies and backward countries" should rest on fundamentally class

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, p. 151.

² Ibid., Vol. 31, p. 149.

positions: and that it "...should not merge with it (*bourgeois democracy—R.T.*), and should under all circumstances uphold the independence of the proletarian movement even if it is in its most embryonic form".¹ On November 18, 1919, Lenin told the Second All-Russia Congress of Communist Organisations of the Peoples of the East that in the course of the national liberation movement in conditions of an upsurge of bourgeois nationalism, the Communists should, with due regard to the specific conditions of each given country, elucidate the Marxist theory to the working people and impress upon them that the class unity with the proletariat of other countries is an earnest of their successes.²

Such are the basic laws of the national liberation movement which Lenin examined in his works and which are operating today as they had done in the past.

The close link between the struggle for national liberation and the struggle for social emancipation of the proletariat formulated in the Marxist-Leninist theory has made it possible to pose the issue of national self-determination in a new way, in line with the demands of the times.

Marxism, as the ideology of the proletariat, could not ignore the bourgeois idea of national self-determination which appeared in Europe in the 18th and 19th centuries, and which stood only for the formation of national states, for this idea mirrored the objectively operating factor—the national liberation movement. But Marxism, naturally, approached this idea from the point of view of the interests of the proletariat and working sections of the population in general, and also took account of the laws of the development of the national liberation movement. As a result the democratic content of the idea of self-determination was further developed in the new conditions. The right to self-determination became a vital factor of the future. Marxism proceeded from the premise that for the proletarians of the ruling nation the national liberation of the oppressed peoples was "*the first condition of their own social emancipation*".³

¹ Ibid., p. 150.

² Ibid., Vol. 30, p. 162.

³ K. Marx, F. Engels, *Selected Correspondence*, Moscow, 1956, p. 287.

Thus, the idea of national self-determination, a class weapon used until then by the bourgeoisie to enslave the working people of their own country and to incite them against other peoples, has been turned into a class weapon designed to emancipate the peoples and to establish an international alliance of the working people against capitalism in their fight for democracy and socialism.

This circumstance gave rise to the following fundamental practical conclusions: national self-determination could not be an aim in itself, just as it could not stand solely for the right to form national states.

The different class approach to the political slogan of self-determination gave rise to two kinds of nationalism—democratic and reactionary.

Anti-Soviet publications frequently quote what appear to be (taken out of context) categorical statements by Lenin to the effect that the right to self-determination stands for one thing only—the right to establish states. But they omit to mention, either intentionally or unintentionally, the principal, fundamental Marxist viewpoint often elucidated by Lenin that the realisation of genuine self-determination leads to the self-determination of the working people. In 1903, he wrote in the *Iskra*: "As the party of the proletariat, the Social-Democratic Party considers it to be its positive and principal task to further the self-determination of the proletariat in each nationality rather than that of peoples or nations."¹ Sixteen years later, in 1919, Lenin said that "every nation must obtain the right to self-determination, and that will make the self-determination of the working people easier".²

This did not mean and could not mean, however, that the right to self-determination could become the prerogative of the working people only, as Bukharin demanded at the Eighth Congress of the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks). Disputing this statement Lenin replied: "To reject the self-determination of nations and insert the self-determination of the working people would be absolutely wrong, because this

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 6, p. 454.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. 29, p. 174.

manner of settling the question does not reckon with the difficulties, with the zigzag course taken by differentiation within nations."¹ Lenin advised to take account of the stage at which a nation finds itself in its development from medievalism to bourgeois democracy and from bourgeois democracy to proletarian democracy.² By then self-determination had been achieved only in Russia where the socialist revolution had won.³ The rest of the world had remained at one of the above-mentioned stages of development. Therefore, it would have been incorrect to substitute the right of the working people to self-determination for the right of the nations to self-determination. Noting that "self-determination of the proletariat is proceeding among the Poles", Lenin warned that the Polish proletariat had a high sense of social patriotism. He, therefore, demanded: "We must wait. We cannot speak here of the self-determination of the working people. We must carry on propaganda in behalf of this differentiation. This is what we are doing, but there is not the slightest shadow of doubt that we must recognise the self-determination of the Polish nation now."⁴

Highly indicative in this respect is Lenin's attitude to the peoples of Central Asia. "What, then, can we do in relation to such peoples as the Kirghizes, the Uzbeks, the Tajiks, the Turkmen, who to this day are under the influence of their mullahs?... Can we approach these peoples and tell them that we shall overthrow their exploiters? We cannot do this, because they are entirely subordinated to their mullahs. In such cases we have to wait until the given nation develops, until the differentiation of the proletariat from the bourgeois elements, which is inevitable, has taken place."⁵

Elucidating the substance of the Marxist approach to the national-colonial question, Lenin said that the Marxists demand freedom, independence, "i.e., freedom of secession for the oppressed nations, not because we have dreamt of splitting up the country economically or of the ideal of small

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 173.

² *Ibid.*

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 170-71, 175.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 174, 175.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 172.

states, but, on the contrary, because we want large states and the closer unity and even fusion of nations, only on a truly democratic, truly internationalist basis, which is *inconceivable* without the freedom to secede".¹ In his opinion rejection of this was a "betrayal of democracy, internationalism and socialism".² Time and again returning to this issue, Lenin, being a true proletarian internationalist, underlined that the Bolsheviks demanded freedom of secession for "all other oppressed and unequal nations without exception" not because they "favour secession, but only because we (Bolsheviks—Ed.) stand for free, voluntary association and merging as distinct from forcible association. That is the only reason".³

Unconditional freedom of national self-determination with the view to promoting social and class self-determination of the working people and their international cohesion, such has always been the substance of Marxism's position concerning the idea and slogan of self-determination. This is what basically distinguishes the issue as posed by the proletariat from the way it is presented by the bourgeoisie.

That is why the principle of self-determination advanced by the French bourgeois revolution proved to be the most inconvenient for the imperialist states in our day.

In 1903, Russian Marxists included the political slogan of self-determination into their party programme. Since then self-determination became a central issue of the theoretical propaganda and practical activity of Marxists in Russia. At first this was due to the multinational composition of tsarist Russia and then to the liberation movement in the colonies.

In 1915, on the basis of a Marxist analysis of the world revolutionary process in the period of the First World War, Lenin reached the far-sighted conclusion of immense practical importance that the right to self-determination must be extended not only to the European nations but also to "all the oppressed peoples, both in Europe ... and outside of Europe, i.e., all colonies".⁴

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 21, pp. 413-14.

² *Ibid.*, p. 414.

³ *Ibid.*, Vol. 23, p. 67.

⁴ *Ibid.*, Vol. 21, p. 291.

In 1916, Lenin wrote that the "liberation of the colonies ... means self-determination of nations. Europeans often forget that colonial peoples *too* are nations, but to tolerate this 'forgetfulness' is to tolerate chauvinism".¹

Thus the Bolsheviks turned the intra-state political slogan of self-determination into an international political principle signifying the demand for self-determination for any people, including the colonial peoples.

Thus, even prior to the October Socialist Revolution, the Bolsheviks viewed the demand for self-determination (1903) as an essential condition for the future reorganisation of Russia. Moreover, it was formulated as an international slogan calling for the fusion of the anti-imperialist forces.

The Bolsheviks were likewise the first (1915) to demand that this right should also be extended to all the nations of the world.

Finally, in their demand for self-determination, the Bolsheviks laid emphasis on international drawing together and the development of the class-consciousness of the working strata of a people in the process of self-determination both on an intra-state (Russia) and on a world scale.

Dwelling on the national policy of the Communist International, Lenin wrote in one of his last works that its "entire policy on the national and the colonial questions should rest primarily on a closer union of the proletarians and the working masses of all nations and countries for a joint revolutionary struggle to overthrow the landowners and the bourgeoisie. This union alone will guarantee victory over capitalism, without which the abolition of national oppression and inequality is impossible".²

The development of the international through the promotion of the national, such has been and remains the dialectics of the only correct, Marxist approach to the solution of the national question in the interests of the working masses.

¹ *Ibid.*, Vol. 23, p. 63.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. 31, p. 146.

5. DOUBLE OPPRESSION

Poetry has always been the leading literary form in the East. All major literary works of the East are poetical. Joy and sorrow, emotions and even politics were expressed in verse. And this in equal measure applies to the peoples of Soviet Central Asia. Their bards in the period of tsarist oppression and the domination of the khans, *bais*¹ and mullahs were Zavki, Furkat, Mukimi, Ahmad Donysh, Sh. Shohin, S. Bustani, T. Asiri, S. Aini, O. Awaz and other classical poets.

The aspirations of the Central Asian peoples were expressed by such prominent enlighteners as Behbudi, Bayeni, Chokar-Mutrib, Mugoni and Fakiri. Outstanding representatives of pre-revolutionary Central Asian culture including Abdulla Qadiri, Mirmuhsin Shermuhamedov, Tavallo, Abdulla Avloni and Abdurauf Fitrat, whose talents blossomed only after the October Socialist Revolution began their life in literature under the influence of these enlighteners.

They are respected today, too. And this respect for the classics of national Central Asian literature is sometimes mentioned even in the writings of those who, having gone over to the side of the enemies are striving to pass for champions of the independence of the peoples whom they had betrayed.

In view of the above it would not be amiss to describe the past of the peoples of Central Asia using the words of Zavki, the last great writer of the pre-revolutionary period, a friend

¹ *Bai*, a wealthy landowner in pre-revolutionary Central Asia. —Tr.

DOUBLE OPPRESSION

61

of Mukimi and Furkat. Born into the family of an impoverished Kokand craftsman, Ubaidulla Salihk (his and his father's real name) Zavki, who did not even have the opportunity to finish a medresseh, became a popular realistic poet, democrat and satirist. In 1920, this great poet, who welcomed the October Socialist Revolution and devoted his life to serving his people, was captured by the *basmachi*. A year later he died in an underground dungeon. He wrote in his dramatically accusatory poem *These Fearful Times*:

*The honest are trampled on, rascals—encouraged by law;
The tastiest fruit disappear in the crow's greedy maw.
The nightingale covets the burgeoning rosebud no more,
And groans of despair are heard where jubilant songs*
used to soar.

*All over the world Evil scatters its ominous seed.
True art connoisseurs are dubbed liars: hard lives they must*
lead.

*Forgotten are handicrafts; family ties get no heed.
The peasant, the artist and artisan pine in dire need.
The tattler's falsehood is viewed as the wisest of lore.*

*The scholar flees this land where the dunce wins acclaim;
Pure spirits withdraw from the public for fear and for shame.
Disastrous indeed is the plight of the sage once in fame,
While those now in favour are humans only in name,
In squeaking galoshes, with turbans on heads staffed with*
straw.

*No pity is there for the homeless, the hungry, the poor.
Not a morsel of food from the rich can they ever procure.
Unspeaking hardships must orphans and widows endure.
In vain is their wailing, there's no one to hear it, for sure!
Only those are esteemed who have money and garments*
galore.

*The world teems with infamy; filth has discarded its mask.
The people are chained, for no fault and no cause put to task.
Friends rise against friends. For what reason? Ah, better*
not ask!

A father won't trust his own son, who once in his love used
to bask.

*Accursed be the times that bring riches and power to the
fore!
The rich to show mercy? Such feelings they only despise.
Spread knowledge? The glitter of money is all that they
prize.
A plague on each one of those pitiless beasts in disguise!*

* * *

Defining the current tasks of the Party on the national question, the Tenth Congress of the RCP(B) gave the following description of the policy of tsarism in Russia's national outskirts: "The policy of tsarism, the policy of the landowners and the bourgeoisie with regard to these peoples was designed to stifle all rudiments of statehood, cripple their culture, check the development of their language, keep them in ignorance and, finally, Russify them as much as possible. This policy accounts for the undeveloped state and the political backwardness of these peoples."¹

Prior to its accession to Russia, Central Asia exported primarily handicrafts production with raw materials accounting for a much smaller share (45 and 30 per cent in value). After joining Russia Central Asia began to produce minerals and expanded cotton cultivation. The construction of the Central Asian and Transcaspian railways speeded up the transformation of this region into a source of agricultural raw materials. Only two per cent of the vast territory of Central Asia, or about three-quarters of the cultivated area, were irrigated.

The establishment of the first capitalist cotton plantations by Russian commercial and industrial firms at the end of the 19th century resulted in the rapid growth of cotton production and cotton deliveries to Russia. The area under cotton increased by several times and by 1915 amounted to 15.9 per cent of the total sown area in Turkestan. The growth of cotton shipments out of Central Asia may be judged by the fact that from 1888 to 1890, that is, in three years they increased threefold, and by 1915, almost 18 times reaching some 25,000

¹ *GPSU in Resolutions...*, Part I, Ed. 7, Moscow, 1953, pp. 558-59 (in Russian).

tons. These cotton deliveries accounted for 50 per cent, and in some years for even a greater part of the total output of cotton fibre in Russia (the rest of the cotton was imported).

Central Asia has always specialised in fruit and grape cultivation and cattle-breeding, particularly the breeding of sheep, including karakul. Out of a total of 6,779,783 inhabitants of Turkestan in 1915, 1,850,711, or a quarter were nomads or semi-nomads. From Russia Central Asian karakul skins were shipped abroad.

Central Asia's accession to Russia sharply stimulated silk production, with Central Asian cocoons accounting for 80 or 90 per cent of the total number exported from Russia and constituting an important item on her export list.

The status of Central Asia as a source of agricultural raw materials in the economic system of the Russian Empire determined the character of its industrial development. The first enterprises to be built there were factories for the primary processing of cotton to facilitate its transportation to central Russia: ginneries (235 enterprises, 15,000 workers), oil mills and tanneries. There was a small mining industry engaged mainly in the production of coal, oil and certain ores and the manufacturing industry was practically non-existent. So it was that a land of cotton and silk did not have a single textile mill.

The manufacturing industry of pre-revolutionary Turkestan had only 702 enterprises employing 21,000 workers, of whom 16,000 were native inhabitants.

The long-established handicrafts industry gradually lost its former importance in the new conditions.

The industrial proletariat was just beginning to appear and numbered only 60,000, of whom 50 per cent were employed on the railways. Workers from among the local nationalities, who also made up about 50 per cent of the industrial proletariat, were unskilled in their majority. Taken together, the workers of Turkestan comprised a mere 0.35 per cent of the population.

The poor peasants, that is the bulk of the population, suffered not only from plunder by the local feudal lords and the clergy, but were also exploited by the Russian capitalists.

In effect, the working peasants were subjected to double oppression.

The state requisitioned the best land and then leased it out to peasants or assigned it to the settlers.

Both the government and the tsar, the country's biggest landowners, amassed huge profits from this land policy. A case in point is the crown estate, the personal property of Nicholas II in Bairam-Ali. Several dams were built across the Murgab to irrigate 104,000 dessiatines¹ of fertile lands of His Majesty the Emperor of Russia, which were leased to métayers who were obliged to grow cotton on them. The métayers sold their cotton harvest at low prices to Bairam-Ali ginneries, oil mills and soap factories, from where a part of the output was delivered to Russia by means of the Transcaspian Railway which was built specially for the purpose.

Well acquainted with the life of the peasants, the people's poet of Khorezm Otar Awaz wrote on the eve of the October Revolution:

*"For dehkans² a crust of bread is worth its weight in gold.
As for clothes—the rags they wear are dirty, torn and old.
People have run out of fuel; many die of cold.
Why is it that even now, in this frost untold,
Only dreams of summer have our people to keep warm?"*

*Some own harems, palaces—an earthly paradise.
Others, not an ell of land; pies only in the skies.
One can wound with words like swords, another starves and dies.*

*God Almighty! Seeing this, who can call you wise?
What an awful time is this when knaves and scoundrels swarm!"*

For several centuries Central Asia was greatly lagging in cultural and scientific development. The feudal internecine strife, the decay of the parasitical feudal upper strata and the clergy and the obscurantism of religion had completely

¹ Dessiatine—an old square measure introduced in Russia in 1753; equal to 2.7 acres.

² Dehkans—peasants.—Tr.

deprived Central Asia, once a centre of science, literature and art, of its former greatness.

Of course, there were educated people there, but their education was religious as a rule. Few people managed to break through the wall isolating them from Western culture and to assimilate progressive views against the will of the local nobility and the tsarist rule. Progressive, educated people of Turkestan, (Mukimi, Furkat, Donysh and others) gradually came to know Russian culture. Exiled democrats, freethinkers and later Bolsheviks brought progressive ideas to those people in Turkestan who could and would accept them. Yet, this fruitful process of international drawing together and mutual enrichment was viewed with disfavour by the authorities and, consequently, was not well developed.

Russia under tsarism was herself a country where the bulk of the population was illiterate. So what could be said of her colonial border regions.

For example, on the territory of what is now Uzbekistan there were 7,000 schools and medressehs with 73,000 pupils before the Revolution. They were wholly controlled by the Muslim clergy. All secular schools which numbered only 171 offered only primary education and were attended by 18,000 pupils, mostly children of the local landlords, mullahs and traders.

The tsarist government's allocations for public education were miserably small. In Turkestan 22 kopecks were spent on the education of one person. Only 1.5 per cent of the population could read and write and a mere three per cent of the children went to school.

Tearing the mask of the oppressors, the celebrated poet democrat Awaz of Khorezm wrote at the beginning of the 20th century:

*The power of prejudice rules over men thanks to you.
The people are oppressed and impoverished since heaven
knows when thanks to you.*

*Ye lawyers and judges, according to what earthly law
Should a nation entire live like pigs in a pen thanks to you?*

*To make people willless, you keep them all ignorant slaves.
The land they were born in is foreign to them thanks to you.*

*Yet a day will arrive, the creator will call you and say:
My people—degraded are they beyond ken thanks to you!*

*While all you pursue in this world are titles and cash,
Untaught, they can use neither pencil nor pen thanks to you.*

*Say, are we not humans? Do we not love music and books?
And yet we exist like wild beasts in their den thanks to you.*

*One day will the people awaken and force you to pay
For a world that became like a desert for men thanks to you.*

Women were deprived of all rights, for that was in keeping with Islam and with the desire of tsarism to keep the peoples in ignorance. Women were an essential, but an absolutely benighted part of the household. They could be sold in their girlhood and that in effect was their marriage.

Slavery and slave-trade existed in Central Asia right up to the Revolution. The tsarist government ignored this outrageous fact, although in its time it ostentatiously called for the abolition of slavery and signed corresponding international agreements in 1841 and 1890.

Pre-revolutionary Central Asia was a colony of tsarist imperialism, its source of cotton, a market for industrial commodities, an area from which it squeezed colossal profits. At the turn of the century it was also partially given over to settlers from Russia.

At one social pole there were the peasants and workers, international in their composition, and, at the other, there were commercial and industrial capitalists, both Russian and local, and wealthy landowners from among the local feudal lords and the clergy.

The Turkestan administration was geared to meet the economic and political interests of the Russian capitalists. Its task was to preclude any possibility of Russia's positions being undermined and simultaneously to display flexibility in rela-

tions with the neighbouring British possessions and the two "national" feudal protectorates of Bukhara and Khiva.

All non-political matters were handled by the local feudal élite.

All political power resided in the military administration headed by a governor-general (the Turkestan Governor-Generalship was subordinate to the War Ministry).

As any other imperialism, Russian imperialism zealously protected its possessions from the penetration of foreign capital, particularly that of Britain, Russia's old rival.

Embarking on their liberation in 1917, the peoples of Central Asia threw off the yoke of both national and social oppression to break out of their state of backwardness and ignorance.

In 1918, Sadriddin Aini, a participant in the revolution and founder of the Tajik Soviet literature, wrote the *March of Freedom* to the melody of the *Marseillaise*. It had the following lines:

*Henceforward Liberty discards its chains at last.
Let vengeance fall on tsars and emirs!
Henceforward Labour knows no lords or peers;
Alone it rules with power sublime and vast!*

6. THE LIBERATION OF THE CENTRAL ASIAN PEOPLES

From the point of view of the fullness to which it has been implemented the self-determination of the peoples of Central Asia was a characteristic development. At the same time it had its specific features because of the complexity of the problems which had to be solved then.

On the eve of the October Socialist Revolution, Central Asia consisted of the Bukhara Emirate, which under the treaties signed with Russia on May 11, 1868¹ and September 28, 1873² was virtually reduced to the status of a protectorate; the Khiva Khanate, whose khan by the treaty of August 12, 1873 declared himself a "faithful servant of the Russian Emperor", a protégé ruler³; and the Turkestan Governor-Generalship of the Russian Empire.

The population of each of these territories had a varied ethnic composition in which not a single nationality constituted a compact majority. The administrative-territorial division of each of the above territories did not coincide with the national-ethnic boundaries, and the Central Asian nationalities, including the biggest—Uzbeks, Tajiks, Kirghizes and Turkmenians—were split up as a result.

For a number of years after the October Revolution the self-determination of the Central Asian peoples took place

¹ *Collection of Operating Treaties...*, St. Petersburg, 1889, Vol. I, p. 324 (in Russian).

² *Ibid.*, 1902, Vol. I, pp. 421-25.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 425-27.

within these territorial boundaries, and at the first and main stage by virtue of this fact alone it could not have been national either in form or in content¹. Strictly speaking there were no nations there in those years. Nevertheless, self-determination in Central Asia was definitely anti-colonial and not only anti-imperialist, but also anti-feudal and anti-capitalist in character, and, of course, it was social in content. It was rooted in the desire of the people, of the multinational strata of working people, to cast off the social and national yoke of Russian colonialism and imperialism and the social yoke of the local feudal lords, money-lenders, bourgeois compradors who were not homogeneous in their national-ethnic composition.

Such a state of affairs, however, did not remove the national factor from the order of the day, all the more so in the future, since this was a factor that could influence the development in one or another direction. Therefore, the right of the peoples to self-determination officially proclaimed by Soviet power in its Decree on Peace remained valid. In equal measure this right applied to all foreign peoples as it did to all the oppressed peoples of the Russian Empire.

This was confirmed in the historical "Declaration of the Rights of the Peoples of Russia" proclaimed by the Soviet Government on November 2 (15), 1917. In its efforts to form a "voluntary and honest union of the peoples of Russia" and to unite the workers and peasants, "the peoples of Russia into a single revolutionary force", the Soviet Government, proceeding from the right to free self-determination of the peoples of Russia proclaimed at the First and Second congresses of Soviets, declared that it would make the following points "the basis of its activity with regard to the question of the nationalities of Russia:

¹ It was not by accident that in those and later years, the internal counter-revolution and the imperialists, assisted particularly by the Turkish nationalists, tried to incite these peoples against the Russian people by advancing Pan-Turkist and Pan-Islamic slogans. These slogans are still heard today, but now in connection with the fact that since 1924 the peoples of Central Asia have consolidated themselves nationally and territorially in their independent republics and have thus dealt a blow at Pan-Turkism and Pan-Islamism.

1. Equality and sovereignty of the peoples of Russia.
2. The right of the peoples of Russia to free self-determination up to and including secession and the formation of independent states.
3. Abolition of all and any national and national-religious privileges and restrictions.
4. Free development of the national minorities and ethnic groups inhabiting the territory of Russia."¹

After that the Soviet Government passed another important document which in effect emphasised the inviolability of the right to self-determination, as the right of all peoples living both on the territory of the former Russian Empire and beyond its borders. It was the appeal to "All-Working Muslims of Russia and the East", published on November 20 (December 3), 1917, in the languages of the peoples of Russia and the East. Confirming the right to self-determination the Soviet Government proclaimed: "Arrange your national life freely as you think fit. This is your right."²

Addressed to the Muslims of Russia, including the Muslims of Turkestan, the appeal said: "You must know that your rights, just as the rights of all the peoples of Russia are upheld by the entire might of the Revolution and its institutions. Our banners bring emancipation to the oppressed peoples of the world. . . . On this path leading to the renovation of the world we expect to have your understanding and support."³ The fight for socialism in the central parts of Russia in practice merged with the fight against national and colonial oppression in the border regions of the colonial empire.

The alliance and the interlinking of these two torrents of the struggle for liberation, so characteristic of the present-day world, was first observed in the process of the self-determination of the peoples of Central Asia where self-determination was closely connected with a number of factors. These factors were characteristic of Central Asia, as distinct from those in Europe. And yet, the current decolonialisation of the

¹ *USSR Foreign Policy Documents*, Gospolitizdat Publishing House, Vol. 1, 1957, p. 15 (in Russian).

² *Ibid.*, p. 34.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 34, 35.

Third World shows that in general they were typical of the self-determination of the peoples lagging behind in their socio-economic development:

1. Self-determination took place within the territorial boundaries of the colonial period, which had split up the national-ethnic groups of the population.

2. The subject of self-determination was (at first) not a formed nation or even nationality on its way towards consolidating into a nation, but a multinational population with numerous ethnic groups united in their efforts to eliminate colonial and internal social oppression.

3. Liberation from colonialism took place in conjunction with the struggle for social emancipation through socialist revolution, international in its spirit, objectives and factors.

4. This social emancipation was in effect a leap from pre-capitalist to socialist relations of production.

5. This socio-historical leap took place in a region which practically had no national proletariat.

6. The self-determination of the peoples of Central Asia, in view of the coincidence of their interests and the interests of the Russian proletariat from the very outset, rested on the class alliance of the local peasantry and the working class of Russia. In the period from 1917 to 1920, bourgeois-democratic tasks in Central Asia were solved with the support of the socialist revolution in Russia as a whole and under its decisive influence.

Right up to the reorganisation of Central Asia on a national basis in 1924, self-determination involved the people, the working strata who were international in their national and ethnic composition. This was predetermined by the intensity and interconnection of national and social contradictions. The latter, in general, were typical of the entire epoch which Lenin called the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolutions.

It is only natural, therefore, that the contemporary epoch ushered in by the October Revolution, the epoch of the transition from capitalism to socialism, from the very beginning (it first happened in Central Asia) has been practically demonstrating the organic connection between social and class emancipation and national liberation. Moreover, the entire

course of social development of this epoch has in effect demonstrated that the national question is in final count a social question and can be solved only as such.

In their anti-Soviet writings on the demography, social and class structure and the political and administrative life of the Central Asian republics, the so-called Sovietologists unfailingly play up "Russian question" which had existed in the past and is allegedly present today, too.

There is no doubt that having penetrated Central Asia tsarism tried to colonise it by resettling landless peasants of Russia there and even established a special administration for this purpose. Beginning with the end of the 19th century, Central Asia became an area where not only peasant settlers came to live but also Russian workers, mostly railwaymen, and also political exiles from Russia. They became part of the population, particularly in the Central Asian towns. At that time Russian workers made up less than a half of the Central Asian working class. Due to their class ideological and organisational links with the proletariat of the central parts of Russia, they became the organisationally consolidating factor and the nucleus of the vanguard of the Central Asian revolutionary forces. Their class interests coincided with the interests of the local proletariat and the struggle for liberation waged by the Central Asian peoples as a whole. As part of the Central Asian working class, the Russian workers were in the vanguard of the struggle for the national liberation and social emancipation of the Central Asian peoples in which the internationalist unity of the working class matured and became steered and proletarian internationalism gained in strength.

Had the Russian workers in Central Asia been an alien element and had not their class interests and internationalism been so near and clear to the working people they would not have followed them. This class alliance had been forged in the years since the Revolution of 1905 and rested on the unity of class and internationalist tasks of the Russian proletariat and all the working sections of the local nationalities.

Contrary to the assertions of some bourgeois historians and of the venomous enemies of the Soviet Union from among the bourgeois nationalists whom the proletarian revolution had

swept out of the country, the local peoples were not inactive in those difficult years but vigorously participated in the struggle for social emancipation, the basis of national freedom. In the course of a hard-fought class struggle they produced their own capable organisers and leaders of the revolutionary masses of Central Asia.

To see this, one needs only leaf through a popular collection which has been published in Tashkent under the title of *October Socialist Revolution and the Civil War in Turkestan. Reminiscences of Participants* (in Russian). The contributing authors are former workers and peasants, intellectuals, people of various nationalities of Central Asia, members of the CPSU and non-Party people—all of them veterans of the Revolution and the Civil War. Among them are such celebrated men of art and science as the founder of the Tajik Soviet literature Sadriddin Aini, founder of the Uzbek Soviet literature Hamza Hakim-Zade Niyazi, statesmen and Party functionaries Faizulla Hojayeve, Yuldash Ahunbabayev, Hamrakul Tursunkulov and others.

The crucible of war brought forth military talents such as Faizulla Hojayeve and Abdulla Yarmuhamedov. Mirmuhisin Shermuhamedov, poet, writer, journalist and editor of a number of military newspapers fought on the Eastern Front. The poet Tavallo was a Red Army scout. And the Muslim Regiment made up of men and commanders of Central Asian nationalities won glory on the field of battle. . . .

The revolutionary struggle for Soviet power in Central Asia must have been truly popular in nature and scope to have attracted the downtrodden women of the East into its ranks. Many women became organisers of revolutionary transformations. For example, J. Abidova, a CPSU member since 1927, was one of those who organised and guided the work among the Uzbek women in the period from 1920 to 1930; Aisha, a Turkmenian woman, a Bolshevik, played a vigorous part in the fight against the Emir of Bukhara in Charjou; S. Gaibjanova was active in the women's communist movement; T. Ibragimova, member of the CPSU since 1924, fought in the Civil War in the Ferghana Valley and was one of the first Uzbek women to join the work of emancipating women (in 1922 she met Lenin), and many others.

Besides the major nationalities, smaller nationalities and national minorities who comprised large compact groups in some regions, also actively joined the revolutionary process of the self-determination of the peoples of Central Asia. In Semirechye, for instance, these nationalities were Uighurs, Dungans and others who had come from Western China and Sinkiang. A number of prominent figures emerged from their midst in the course of the joint struggle of the Central Asian people for their national liberation and social emancipation. For example, the Uighur Communist Abdulla Razybakiyev, was member of the first Territorial Military Revolutionary Committee of Semirechye (he was elected to the post by the Uighur-Dungan poor) and Chairman of the Jarkent Uyezd¹ and City Military Revolutionary Committee. The Taranchinsky Uighur Cavalry Regiment, which he formed and whose commissar he became, covered a long and glorious road.

The Dungans who left Northwest China after the defeat of their national liberation movement of 1862-77 and settled in Semirechye, the Ferghana Valley and the basin of the Syrdarya numbered several thousand in Turkestan by 1917. They participated in the fighting against the whiteguard units of atamans Annenkov, Dutov and Bakich and the *basmachis*. They produced such gifted military leaders as, for example, Red Guard commander Vangar Tityankuyev, organiser of the Third International Muslim Battalion (1918) and Magaza Masanchin, commander of the Separate Turkestan Dungan Cavalry Regiment which fought bravely against the counter-revolutionary forces.²

Proletarian internationalism, a typical feature of the self-determination of peoples in the contemporary era, found its expression in Central Asia not only in the unity of the local toiling masses and the Russian working class in the revolutionary struggle, but also in the vigorous support of Hungarian, Czech, Slovak, Serbian, Croatian, Polish, Austrian, German and other prisoners of war for the self-determination of the peoples of Central Asia.

¹ Uyezd—district.—Tr.

² I. Yusupov, *Dungans in the Fight for Soviet Power in Turkestan*, Frunze, 1967 (in Russian).

Bailey, Ellis, Caroe, Hayit, Wheeler and other anti-Soviet writers¹ allege that only hunger and difficult conditions forced the foreign soldiers to join the struggle of the Central Asian peoples against the whiteguards, *basmachis* and the British interventionists. In actual fact, however, the overwhelming majority of these prisoners of war influenced by the great ideas of the October Revolution came to realise that their destiny was closely connected both with the destiny of revolutionary Russia in general and with the struggle of the local population for the establishment of Soviet power, and that their own freedom and the possibility of returning home depended on the successful outcome of this struggle. Under the influence of the propaganda conducted by the Communists they developed a sense of proletarian internationalism and began forming militant communist groups.

There were 32,000 prisoners of war (90 per cent from the Austro-Hungarian Army) in Turkestan when it was surrounded and ravaged by counter-revolutionary forces and the interventionists in the middle of 1918. Only three per cent were in the service of the British interventionists.

Another manifestation of proletarian internationalism was the increase in the influx of volunteers into the Red Army of Turkestan from among the prisoners of war after the revolutions in Austria-Hungary and Germany. In the latter half of 1918, they made up more than 15 per cent of its numerical strength. This, however, does not mean, as some ill-wishers assert, that it was only thanks to these prisoners of war that the peoples of Central Asia were able to liberate themselves and go ahead with self-determination.² By the beginning of 1920, they accounted for ten per cent of the Red Army of Turkestan and shortly after that only an insignificant number of them remained in its ranks.

The Red Army was international in character from the moment it was formed, for it has been and is today the army

¹ F. M. Bailey, *Mission to Tashkent*, London, 1946.

C. N. Ellis, *The Transcaspian Episode, 1918-1919*, London, 1963.

Olaf Caroe, *Soviet Empire. The Turks of Central Asia and Stalinism*, London-New York, 1954, and others.

² For example, see Olaf Caroe, *Soviet Empire. The Turks of Central Asia and Stalinism*, London, 1954, p. 103.

of the multinational Soviet family of peoples. In those days the Red Army units operating in Central Asia were raised on the spot out of people of all nationalities, including Russians. It is common knowledge that during the Civil War and foreign intervention not only prisoners of war but volunteers from many capitalist countries of Europe and Asia were with the Red Army which was fighting for the establishment of Soviet power.

The modern "critics" of the solution of the national question in the USSR, people who are still pretending to "defend the national" but who are in effect mourning the destiny of the bourgeois-nationalistic elements in the self-determination of the peoples of Central Asia, can be reminded of yet another typical example of the manifestation of the international solidarity of the working people, of proletarian internationalism.

The First Uzbek Congress of Soviets, held in Bukhara in 1925, was attended by a delegation from the young Communist Party of Great Britain. Its participation in the Congress and the speech delivered by the member of its Central Committee and member of the Executive Committee of the Communist International Ernest Brown was convincing proof of the working people's international unity in the fight against imperialism. In token of this unity Ernest Brown presented the Congress with a red banner made by Yorkshire workers as a gift to those who took part in the fighting against the British-supported *basmachi* during the Civil War. On January 16, 1968, the *Morning Star* carried an article about this memorable event and a photograph of E. Brown in national Uzbek costume, a gift from the Congress delegates.

The example of self-determination of the peoples of Central Asia teaches proletarian internationalism in the fight of the peoples for self-determination.

There is every reason to say that lacking the alliance and the mutual assistance of the local working people and the Russian working class there would have been no victory of the revolution in Central Asia and no self-determination of her peoples. And not just because they were weak, but because they were confronted by the united forces of the local exploiters, the Russian bourgeoisie and the whiteguards, and international, primarily British, imperialism.

The surging decolonisation process characteristic of the third stage of the general crisis of capitalism has produced numerous examples of the effective support of the Communists of the metropolitan countries and the working people and Communists of other countries for the national liberation movement and the self-determination of the colonies.

It has always been the supreme internationalist duty of the proletariat and its vanguard, the Communist and Workers' Parties of all countries, to support and assist the liberation struggle of the peoples.

The all-round support of the Russian working people headed by the Bolsheviks (and also the internationalist prisoners of war in the period from 1917 to 1920) for the self-determination of the Central Asian peoples was just the first and convincing manifestation of one of the objective socio-historical laws of the self-determination of dependent and colonial peoples. That explains the notoriously malevolent attitude of the modern calumniators—the ideological neo-colonialists—whenever they take up the "Russian question" and the "question of prisoners of war" and their role in the liberation of the Central Asian peoples from national and social oppression.

In present-day conditions the poorly concealed propaganda appeal for preserving the "purity of the national forces" in the process of self-determination, incompatible even with the bourgeois concept of "nationalities" of the past century, is tantamount to an appeal for self-isolation of the national liberation movement both in the national-ethnic and in the political sense. It definitely dooms the people's efforts to achieve genuine self-determination to failure and leads to the preservation of direct or masked imperialist domination.

Time and again history has shown that the success of the genuine self-determination of peoples and nations, particularly in the backward areas of the world, depends on the international solidarity of the working people, of the working class of all countries and on the all-round assistance of the socialist states.

The free expression of the people's will was the object of the right to self-determination in Central Asia. At first it took the form of an uprising and armed struggle for national

independence and social freedom, a struggle against external forces—tsarism, Russian capitalism and British imperialism—and also against the internal counter-revolution. Later, it developed in conditions of peace.

The revolution in Central Asia, which began with an armed uprising of the working masses and led to the immediate overthrow of the political domination of the exploiters, was not brought on the points of "Russian bayonets", as the present-day bourgeois ideologists claim. The real weapon was the ideas of national liberation and social emancipation that had penetrated deep into the masses with the October Socialist Revolution.

The content of the self-determination of the peoples of Central Asia included the choice of socialism as the road of social development and the solution of the national question in its entirety on this basis, and first and foremost, the solution of the problem of accelerated economic development, the establishment of national statehood and political organisation in general in keeping with the people's wishes and to meet their needs and ensure the flourishing of national culture. Self-determination of this kind did not take place all at once in Central Asia. Its first and the most difficult stage lasted from 1917 to 1924, that is, until the demarcation of Central Asia on a national basis and the territorial consolidation of the socialist nations which began to take shape there after the Revolution. A feature of this period was the uneven development of various parts of Central Asia and the ensuing necessity to level it out.

Owing to their different political status, socio-economic level and level of the development of the productive forces and other factors, self-determination did not proceed at an equal pace in the Bukhara Emirate and the Khiva Khanate, on the one hand, and in Turkestan, on the other.

The specific features of the development of the revolutionary processes in these areas have been studied by Central Asian historians. Having started in 1917, these processes lagged behind in the more backward Bukhara and Khiva. In Turkestan, as a result of the armed uprising in Tashkent on November 1 (14), 1917, power passed into the hands of the working people. Two weeks later the Third Territorial Con-

gress of Soviets of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies proclaimed the power of Soviets throughout Turkestan and established the supreme territorial organ of power—the Council of People's Commissars of Turkestan. On May 1, 1918, the Fifth Territorial Congress of Soviets proclaimed the establishment of the first socialist state in Central Asia and its voluntary entry into the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic as the Turkestan Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic.

Connected with this period of the self-determination of the peoples of Central Asia is the history of the so-called Kokand Autonomy. The "Kokand Autonomy" was created by the local bourgeois nationalists and Russian capitalists who sought to safeguard their selfish interests. Dealing with this autonomy many anti-Soviet writers endeavour to represent its emergence as genuine expression of the will of the Central Asian peoples, while all the other developments which took place during this turbulent period allegedly deserve no attention whatever. One of these writers, Geoffrey Wheeler, went to the extent of saying that the "creation and extinction of the 'Kokand government', both within a period of three months, are among the most significant events of the whole Russian Revolution, which claimed to have granted self-determination to hitherto subject peoples".¹ The "Kokand Autonomy" is often cited as an example allegedly illustrating how Soviet power grants the right to self-determination "in words and tramples upon this right in effect". Particular zeal in spreading this falsehood was displayed by Mustafa Chokayev, one of the principal figures in this "autonomy".

In this connection the falsifiers of the history of the Central Asian peoples should be reminded that the so-called Kokand Autonomy was not a special formation peculiar to Central Asia alone and resulting from what these writers regard as self-determination of the peoples, inasmuch as after the October Revolution, during the Civil War and foreign military intervention local bourgeois nationalists, tsarist generals and foreign interventionists created a large number

¹ G. Wheeler, *The Modern History of Soviet Central Asia*, London, 1965, pp. 105-06.

of "governments" and "autonomies" on the territory of the former tsarist empire, including the centre of Russia. They were anti-popular in character and in some cases stooped to outright political banditism. The revolutionary proletariat swept them out of the country together with the tsarist generals and foreign interventionists.

The events connected with the short-lived "Kokand Autonomy" show that the bourgeois nationalists juggle with the right to self-determination to further their own class interests and go as far as to betray the interests of the people.

In 1917, as the national liberation movement gained momentum in Turkestan, nationalists from among the local feudal lords, the bourgeoisie and the clergy decided to take advantage of the right of nations to self-determination proclaimed by Soviet power in an attempt to assert their domination which the Revolution had sentenced to death.

Following the transition of power in Tashkent into the hands of the Soviets, a large number of the local and Russian bourgeoisie, feudal lords and Muslim clergy fled to Ferghana. With them was Mustafa Chokayev, Chairman of the so-called Territorial Muslim Council (Shura-i-Islamiya, an organisation of the Turkestan bourgeoisie established in March 1917). Thus, from the very beginning, the opponents of the socialist revolution began to gather in Kokand, the Ferghana's principal city and Turkestan's major economic centre. They were a motley lot as regards their national composition, but united in their counter-revolutionary anti-Soviet designs. They were fused together by their class hatred, and not by common national principles and least of all by the interests of national liberation. Here, as in the rest of Turkestan, there was an "anti-Soviet alliance of national feudal and bourgeois circles of the territory with the Russian bourgeoisie, counter-revolutionary officialdom and also the petty bourgeois parties of the Mensheviks and the Socialist-Revolutionaries".¹

This became manifest at the Fourth Extraordinary Territorial Muslim Convention (December 9 to 11, 1917) at which

¹ K. Novoselov, *Against Bourgeois Falsifiers of the History of Central Asia*. Ashkhabad, 1962, p. 86 (in Russian).

284 delegates out of 300 were local and Russian capitalists, merchants, money-lenders, wealthy landowners, representatives of the Muslim clergy and bourgeois-nationalistic intelligentsia.

Greeting the Convention the Kokand mayor, a representative of the Russian bourgeoisie said: "Turkestan undoubtedly needs a free autonomy." One delegate Chernayev, speaking on behalf of public education workers, was even more outright in expressing his views. "I consider," he said, "that Turkestan should be proclaimed an autonomous territory which will serve as a foundation for the building of the Russian state along proper lines. Individual regions and small nations must take the future into their own hands for only by doing so will they be able to wage a determined struggle against the Bolsheviks."¹

It is characteristic that prior to the October Socialist Revolution and the passing of power in Tashkent into the hands of the Soviets, the Provisional Government and Russian capitalists categorically opposed the autonomy and secession of Turkestan. But now it suited them to see a "self-determined" Turkestan. Under the domination of Russian capital the bourgeois-nationalistic interests of the local exploiter classes and the class interests of the Russian capitalists coincided in the struggle against the Soviet system which was chosen and backed by the people. Harboring plans of seizing Central Asia Britain was also anxious to see a "self-determined" Turkestan.

The first question on the agenda of the Territorial Muslim Convention was that of the entry of Turkestan into the so-called Southeastern Union of Russia which was put forward and discussed at the initiative of ataman Dutov who had captured Orenburg three weeks earlier. In this way Turkestan was cut off from Russia. Dutov sent to the Convention a draft of a treaty providing for the establishment of a large state to include all territories from the Altai and Western Siberia in the east, to the North Caucasus and the Black Sea in the west. From north to south it was to include the entire terri-

¹ P. Alexeyev, "Kokand Autonomy". *Revolution in Central Asia*, Tashkent, 1928, p. 36 (in Russian).

tory stretching from Bashkiria to the Pamirs.¹ Passions flared up at the Convention and the question was not resolved. But the counter-revolutionary plan of uniting all anti-Soviet and anti-popular forces into a Muslim-Christian and Russo-Turkic state was welcomed by some representatives of the Muslim clergy and the local wealthy merchants, and, of course, by the Russian bourgeoisie.²

On the night of December 11, 1917, the Convention proclaimed the "autonomy" of Turkestan. Incidentally, this ephemeral anti-popular formation is referred to simply as the "Kokand Autonomy" even by its supporters, including its present-day defenders. And here they are right, for the rule of the organisers of the "autonomy" was confined to the area of Kokand only and received no support from the broad masses.

Mustafa Chokayev replaced Tanyshbayev (former member of the Turkestan Committee of the Provisional Government) at the post of chairman of the "provisional government". Apart from Shagialmedov, Mahmudov and Chanyshiev, the "Kokand government" also included Potelyakhov, Ziegel (representative of the Knopp Firm) and Vadiyev.

The "Kokand government" took its orders from the cotton kings Potelyakhov, Knopp and Vadiyev, and this should be reminded to those "specialists in Soviet affairs" who, disregarding indisputable facts, keep harping about the current "Russification" of the administrative apparatus in the Central Asian republics solely to cast a shadow on the nationalities policy of the USSR and to those who, lacking any convincing proof, portray the still-born "national Kokand autonomy" as an important "national" development in the history of Central Asia.

And it is not accidental that while lauding the "Kokand Autonomy" and mourning its death for half a century now the anti-Soviet historians and journalists do not even hint at the deal between the Turkestan bourgeois nationalists and the Russian capitalists that resulted in the creation of this "auto-

¹ I. Z., "Reminiscences", *Solovetskiye Isles*, 1926, No. 4 (Reminiscences of a former counter-revolutionary Cossack Colonel Zaitsev) (in Russian).

² P. Alexeyev, op. cit., pp. 36-38.

nomy". Colonialists and neo-colonialists are still frequently resorting to such tactics. Among the numerous latest examples is the imperialists' splitting activity in Nigeria, Indonesia and other countries.

Failing in its efforts to win the support of the population and remain in power the "Kokand government" resorted to provocations. For instance, it incited a carnage in Kokand in January and February 1918.¹ Today the defenders of the "Kokand Autonomy" allege that Soviet power was responsible for this. This method is widely employed by the imperialists who often provoke fratricidal clashes in the young states.

Soviet writers have convincingly proved that the "Kokand government" was a "government of national betrayal" and consisted of people least of all concerned with the independence of Turkestan and Central Asia.²

For military support the "Kokand Autonomy" relied on *basmachis* gangs led by Irgash.³ Joseph Castagné, a member of the anti-Soviet underground in Turkestan at the time, characterised this commander-in-chief as "...an out-and-out bandit, who had served a term of imprisonment, he knocked together a formidable band of professional thieves and local peasants whom hunger and economic dislocation had driven into Irgash's band". Pointing out that the "national army" of this self-styled "government" of Turkestan consisted of *basmachis*, Castagné wrote: "Former bandit leaders are now acting in behalf of the population fighting for a national idea. They are now portrayed as the heroes of a great cause; the *basmachis* have become *moudjahids*, that is, heroes waging a holy war."⁴

Exploiting the religious fanaticism of the peasants, their downtroddenness and economic thralldom, the *basmachis* leaders managed to draw a part of the toiling people to

¹ G. Hidoyatov, *Truth Versus Falsehood*, Tashkent, 1964, pp. 117-18 (in Russian).

² K. Novoselov, *Against Bourgeois Falsifiers...*, Ashkhabad, 1962, p. 86 (in Russian).

³ Formally, until the coup of February 18, 1918, the "commander of the Muslim troops" was War Minister Colonel Chanyshiev whom Irgash arrested after the coup.

⁴ J. Castagné, *Les Basmachis*, Paris, 1925, pp. 14-15.

their side in 1918 and 1919. Shortly after the rout of the whiteguard army and the British interventionists who guided and supported the *basmachi* the toiling peasants withdrew their support for the *basmachi* and broke away from them in view of the economic gains of Soviet power. Together with the national units of the Red Army they fought against the *basmachi*, who had once again become the bandit gangs they had been prior to the "Kokand Autonomy".

Member of the "autonomous government", Chanyshiev later testified that the "government of the Turkestan autonomy has no authority with the people and has no influence".¹ But it was of vital importance for the reaction, and all reactionary elements in Turkestan gravitated towards it.

On January 12, 1918, the "autonomous government" made an armed attempt to overthrow Soviet power in Kokand. It tried to capture the fortress in the new town and kill the Chairman of the Soviet, Communist Y. A. Babushkin.

On February 17-18, 1918, in response to the efforts of Soviet power, undertaken with the approval of the Territorial Soviet of Workers' and Peasants' Deputies (established early in January by the "Kokand government" itself), to achieve a peaceful settlement in Kokand, the clergy, commercial bourgeoisie and capitalists launched armed action. Irgash gained control of the leadership of the "Kokand Autonomy", while Mustafa Chokayev, the scheming adventurer who had played a prominent role in the "Kokand Autonomy", fled.

Despite the appeals of the mullahs and the pressure and threats of his armed bands Irgash failed to incite the local population against Soviet power. The local working people united in the Union of Working Muslims and the Ittifoq upheld Soviet power.

On February 19, 1918, Irgash rejected the ultimatum presented by Red Army units which had arrived in response to the call for assistance from the working people and Soviet power in Kokand, and by detachments of armed workers, and took up defences in the old town of Kokand. On the

¹ See: P. Alexeyev, "Kokand Autonomy", *Revolution in Central Asia*, Vol. 2, p. 76 (in Russian).

following day, Irgash, abandoned by the majority of his band, made good his escape. At the request of a delegation from the old town and under the agreement of February 22, 1918 signed by the "autonomists" and the command of the Red Army units the "Kokand Autonomy" ceased to exist. The agreement outlined measures designed to prevent any further outbreaks of counter-revolutionary activity and made it incumbent on the Territorial Council of People's Commissars to "help the poorest sections of the population which had suffered during the Civil War".¹

In their reminiscences the veterans of the battles for the establishment of Soviet power in the Ferghana Valley cite many examples of the internationalist unity of the peasants and the workers in their struggle against the so-called self-determination of the international alliance of the exploiter classes in Kokand and the Ferghana Valley.²

On March 26, 1918, the Soviet of Muslim Workers' Deputies in Tashkent ordered the arrest of the counter-revolutionaries in the old town of Kokand, members of the clerical Ulema party and the leaders of the "Kokand Autonomy".

Such was the inglorious end of the "Kokand Autonomy" and its second and last chairman Mustafa Chokayev. The attempt to turn the "Kokand Autonomy" into an instrument of the self-determination of the bourgeoisie in the process of the national self-determination of the Central Asian peoples fell through. The self-determination of the people, the genuine carriers of this right, triumphed over the "self-determination" of the exploiters. This was the first time in the history of the colonial world that self-determination was effected by the working people.

The example of the "self-determination" in Kokand is extremely instructive for the contemporary process of decolonisation. The imperialists in their foreign policy and the reactionary elements in the young states not infrequently endeavour to use the right to self-determination against its

¹ Ibid., p. 80.

² *Battles for Soviet Power in the Ferghana Valley*, Tashkent, 1957 (in Russian).

very essence, to turn it into its opposite, so as to throw a screen around colonialism or to promote it in the form of neo-colonialism. When, for example, the Netherlands could no longer retain her hold on West Irian, and yet was unwilling to part with it, she moved the idea of self-determination of this integral part of Indonesia. The same method has been used by Britain which does not want to return British Honduras, its colony, to Honduras. On March 19, 1967, France conducted "self-determination" in Djibouti in such a way that as a result of diverse machinations during the referendum "the majority voted" for the preservation of the colonial regime in French Somalia.

But, the efforts illegally to employ the right to self-determination are observed not only in the Third World. Revenge-seeking jurists and politicians in the Federal Republic of Germany urge that the reunification of Germany should take place also on the basis of "self-determination" and demand a referendum in both Germanys for the sole purpose of doing away with the socialist system in the German Democratic Republic.

The persistently repeated lies about "self-determination" in Kokand are aimed at deceiving the public and whitewashing the current neo-colonialist practices.

The events in Kokand showed in practice the importance of establishing the right kind of relations between the proletariat of the former colonial power and the peasant masses of the colony. The establishment of such relations was vital for the solution of the national question. Naturally, there were unavoidable difficulties and errors, which were rectified as early as 1918, particularly on Lenin's instructions. But no one had ever revoked the principle of self-determination of peoples, no one ever called it in question or approached it, as we had mentioned above, with a double gauge.

In April 1918, the Fifth Congress of Soviets of Turkestan Territory proclaimed the autonomy of the territory—the formation of the Turkestan Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic. That was the beginning of Soviet national statehood in Central Asia. Problems of national and state building in the republic were considered at the First Territorial Congress

of Bolshevik Organisations in June 1918 which decided to set up provincial and district commissariats on the national question. All official documents were to be published in the local languages. The course was steered to include representatives of the native population into the administrative machinery and the enlistment of local inhabitants into the Red Army was stepped up.

Self-determination in Bukhara and Khiva took place later and followed a somewhat different course.

In December 1917, the Soviet Government recognised the sovereignty of the Bukhara Emirate and the Khiva Khanate. But the revolutionary movement rapidly gained momentum in these states, too. There was mounting unrest among the peasants and the urban population.

In 1918, Junaid-Khan, a Turkmenian feudal lord who later became a notorious *basmachi* chieftain, assumed dictatorial powers in Khiva. Establishing contact with the British in Iran, on the one hand, and concluding an alliance with Kolchak (which in itself was a violation of the treaty with the RSFSR), on the other, Junaid-Khan repeatedly attacked the Turkestan Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic, ignoring the truce concluded with the RSFSR on April 9, 1919¹. This was a continuation of the internal policy of the reactionaries in Khiva and Bukhara where peasant movements and actions by the working people were brutally crushed in 1918 and 1919.

Gradually leadership in the liberation struggle passed into the hands of the Bukhara and Khiva Communist Parties. The first was established in September 1918 and the other in February 1919.

The Khan of Khiva was deposed on February 1, 1920, as a result of the popular uprising which broke out in Khiva at the end of 1919. At the request of the insurgents the uprising was supported by Red Army units most of which consisted of men of local nationalities and had many Com-

¹ The treaty was ratified by the Presidium of the Turkestan Central Executive Committee and the Revolutionary Military Council of the Turkestan Republic. See: I. Fedko, *Peaceful Negotiations. The October Socialist Revolution and the Civil War in Turkestan*. Reminiscences. Tashkent, 1957, pp. 478-81 (in Russian).

munists in their ranks. On April 30, 1920, the First All-Khorezm Congress of People's Representatives proclaimed the establishment of the Khorezm People's Soviet Republic and adopted its constitution.

On September 13, 1920, representatives of the Khorezm Republic and the Russian Federation concluded a Union Treaty in Moscow. The Government of the RSFSR signed it, as was indicated in Article I of the Treaty, "in keeping with the right of all peoples to free self-determination and rejection of the colonial policy of Russia's former rulers as proclaimed by the RSFSR".¹ This was the first ever international treaty concluded by an eastern country which legally ensured her people the right to self-determination. This event, the first of its kind in the history of international law and international relations, took place in Central Asia thanks to the victory of the socialist revolution in Russia. Under the terms of the treaty the RSFSR renounced all rights to real estates and concessions which Russia had in the Khorezm Republic in favour of the latter. Both sides agreed to exchange diplomatic representatives (plenipotentiaries).

In furtherance of this treaty the two sides on the same day concluded a military and political agreement pledging mutual support in the fight against hostile imperialist forces and local counter-revolutionary groups and detachments², and an economic agreement governing their trade and economic relations.³

The treaty and agreements were drawn up in the Russian and Uzbek languages, both texts being authentic.

The formation of the Khorezm People's Soviet Republic ushered in a new stage in the revolutionary movement of the masses in Khiva. Rallied around the Communist Party they began remodelling their life along new principles and continued to fight successfully against the internal counter-revolution and the unceasing intrigues conducted by the imperialists through Afghanistan, Iran and Turkey. There was an all-round drawing together between the Khorezm Repub-

¹ *USSR Foreign Policy Documents...*, Vol. III, Moscow, 1959, p. 179 (in Russian).

² *Ibid.*, p. 185.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 187-90.

lic and the Turkestan Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic (TASSR). The social consciousness of the people of Khiva matured and strengthened. On October 21, 1923, the Fourth All-Khorezm Congress of People's Representatives transformed the Khorezm People's Socialist Republic into the Khorezm Soviet Socialist Republic which ceased to exist a year later by a decision of the Fifth All-Khorezm Congress in view of the national-territorial delimitation of Central Asia.

The aggravation of the class contradictions, the mounting discontent of the masses with the feudal oppression and the increasing intrigues of the British led to an armed uprising in Bukhara against the Emir under the guidance of the Communist Party. The revolutionary detachments of the insurgents numbered about 5,000 men.¹ The Red Army came to their assistance at their request and in September 1920 the Emir was overthrown. The First All-Bukhara Congress of People's Representatives (October 6 to 8, 1920) proclaimed the establishment of the Bukhara People's Soviet Republic.

In November 1920 in Tashkent, the RSFSR and the Bukhara People's Soviet Republic signed a Provisional Military and Political Agreement and a Provisional Treaty concerning the former Russian settlements in Bukhara.² The terms of these agreements were reflected and developed in the Union Treaty and the Economic Agreement signed by the RSFSR and the Bukhara Republic³ in Moscow on March 4.⁴

Under the Union Treaty, which confirmed the "right of all peoples of the former Russian Empire to free self-determination," the RSFSR Government officially annulled all unequal treaties in favour of the Bukhara Republic, and turned over to it all real estate and concessions formerly owned by tsarism. Taking into account the will of the population expressed at the Regional Congress of the Soviets of Russian Settlements held in Bukhara in October 1920, the RSFSR also turned over the towns of Kagan, Kerki, Charjoi

¹ See: *Soviet Encyclopedia of History*, Vol. 2, p. 874 ((in Russian).

² See: *Victory of Soviet Power in Central Asia and Kazakhstan*, pp. 705-06 (in Russian). Both documents were approved by the Turkestan Commission and the Bukhara Revolutionary Committee.

³ *USSR Foreign Policy Documents...*, Vol. III, pp. 563-69.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 569-72.

and Termez to the Bukhara Republic. Both sides reaffirmed their pledge of mutual assistance and support in the face of the aggressive encroachments of the "world bourgeoisie and its agents".

The treaty and the economic agreement established mutually advantageous economic relations, and both sides agreed to exchange diplomatic representatives.¹

The revolutions in Khiva and Bukhara were accomplished by the working people in the interests of the working people, but owing to a number of objective socio-economic, political and psychological factors and also subjective causes, they could not immediately develop into socialist revolutions. From anti-colonial and anti-imperialist revolutions they gradually evolved into anti-capitalist and socialist revolutions. At that phase there was a specific transitional form of state power—the people's Soviet republic—under which the foundations were built and consolidated and internal forces were prepared for the transition from feudal and pre-feudal formations to socialism, bypassing the capitalist stage of development. This was the first successful experiment in non-capitalist development.²

There is a distinct similarity between this process and what is currently taking place in some of the progressive countries in the areas of decolonisation. Despite specific differences (time and place) there are features common to both processes. Perhaps that is why the example of the self-determination of the Central Asian peoples causes so much worry to the calumniators in the imperialist camp.

The revolutionary changes in Turkestan, Khiva and Bukhara were merely the first stage in the process of self-determination of their peoples. During this stage a maximum possible approximation was achieved in the levels of socio-political development left behind by colonialism in these three parts of Central Asia. It was due to this difference in the level of their development that the Bukhara and the

¹ V. V. Kuibyshev was the first plenipotentiary representative of the RSFSR in Bukhara. He was also a representative of the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks) and the Communist International in Bukhara.

² V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 191.

Khiva People's Soviet republics not being socialist at the time did not enter the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics when it was established in 1922.⁴

The people's Soviet system, the world's first transitional regime from feudal monarchy to socialism established with the support of the people, strengthened and developed in the struggle against the feudal lords and the *basmachi*, against the intrigues of the imperialists and bourgeois nationalists. Bourgeois-democratic problems were solved and socialist problems were posed within the framework of this system which was backward in the socio-economic respect but which relied on the more advanced political power and support of the socialist revolutions in Russia and Turkestan. The political and class-consciousness of the working people steadily matured. All this enabled the Fifth All-Bukhara Congress of People's Representatives on September 19, 1924 to proclaim the transformation of the Bukhara People's Soviet Republic into the Bukhara Soviet Socialist Republic, which ceased to exist on October 27, 1924, following the national delimitation of the Central Asia.

The Central Asian peoples' singular achievements in the economic, cultural and political fields which are widely known in the world, including the Third World, were merely pre-conditioned in the period from 1917 to 1924. They were attained thanks to the victory of socialism in the process of socialist development. It is this aspect of the self-determination of the Central Asian peoples that slanderers and neo-colonialists regard with the greatest alarm.

The fixing of national boundaries, which in other conditions would have been impossible or at best extremely painful, was accomplished smoothly in Central Asia in 1924 on the basis of socialist revolution.

Thus the self-determination of the working people of Central Asia was supplemented by national delimitation, that is, by the formation of national territories, an essential prerequisite for the development of the Central Asian peoples into socialist nations.

⁴ M. Faiziyev, *The Uzbek SSR: a Sovereign State*, Tashkent, 1961, p. 15 (in Russian).

This act, which has always been welcomed by the Central Asian peoples, has inevitably aroused the wrath of the so-called bourgeois nationalists (both semantically and in content this term is inapplicable to those to whom it is frequently applied in connection with the events under review, for they are Pan-Turkists, Pan-Islamists and not nationalists). This thought, for example, is aired by the editor of *Milli Türkistan* Vali Kajum-Han,¹ and by Baymirza Hayit.²

They stubbornly advocate racial unity of the Turkic people and call for Muslim unity. On the surface their ideological position is an astounding eclecticism of Pan-Turkism and Pan-Islamism. Absolutely illogical from the scientific point of view, it is due solely to a desire to undermine the unity of the USSR and the socialist gains of the Central Asian peoples, and is, in effect, an attempt to attain anti-popular, pro-imperialist objectives. This alone tears the mask off the calumniators whose one and only concern is to serve their masters and who merely profess to speak up for genuine liberation and self-determination of peoples and nations, as, for example, Baymirza Hayit is doing.

In their writings the Pan-Turkists and traitors like Hayit often "deplore" that the memory of Faizulla Hojayeov, first Chairman of the Council of People's Commissars of Uzbekistan, has been "relegated to oblivion". So let us reply to them with the words of this outstanding statesman. Rejecting the Pan-Turkists' idea of uniting Turkic tribes he wrote in 1924: "They believe there is no difference between the Kazakh-Kirghizes, Uzbeks, Turkmenians and others. They believe that there are distinctions only between the Turkic peoples and the Tajiks. Is this right? We are convinced that this is wrong."³

Analysing the historical trends in the development of the Central Asian peoples, he noted: "In all cities and villages now inhabited by Turkic peoples there is national isolation and national discord.

¹ *Milli Türkistan*, Ocak-Şubat, 1965, p. 11.

² B. Hayit, *Esir türkler*, p. 47.

³ Faizulla Hojayeov, *Selected Works*, Vol. 1, Tashkent, 1970, p. 360 (in Russian).

"The diversity of geographic and climatic conditions in which the Turkic peoples have lived over the centuries has left its imprint on each of them and made them take up different forms of labour, economy, and so forth. This is an indisputable fact and it has to be faced.

"The idea of the Pan-Turkists will remain a figment of imagination. It is not fated to be translated into practice."¹

Such was the opinion expressed about Pan-Turkism some 50 years ago by a *great* son of the Uzbek people of the 20th century, a genuine patriot and fighter for their bright socialist future.

When speaking about the national territorial delimitation of Central Asia in 1924 the following facts should not be overlooked. First, it was not an exceptional development that took place only in Central Asia and nowhere else. The national-ethnic principle became all important in the course of the administrative territorial division in the whole of the Soviet state which took place immediately after the October Revolution.

Second, national territorial delimitation was of the utmost importance here because tsarist Russia, like other colonial countries, did all she could to aggravate the old and foster new intertribal, interracial and international contradictions to consolidate her domination in Central Asia. These contradictions, especially in view of the dissemination of the bourgeois-nationalistic views of the Young Turks, Young Khivans and Young Bukharians during the mounting liberation anti-colonial struggle, inevitably became a factor impeding the building of socialism and, consequently, the achievement of complete self-determination. The incitement of national strife, the preaching of nationalism and its reverse side chauvinism, hamper the national and social development of any nationality or nation.

Moreover, it should be noted that the question of the national territorial delimitation in Central Asia came up shortly after the October Revolution and not in 1924. It was prepared and carried out (September 1924-February 1925) in accordance with the will of the Central Asian peoples by

¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 360-61.

their representative bodies—the Fifth All-Bukhara and the All-Khorezm congresses of people's representatives and the Extraordinary Session of the Central Executive Committee of the Turkestan Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic, and also in keeping with the resolutions of the Central Committees of the Communist Parties of Turkestan, Bukhara and Khiva, and was approved by the decision of the USSR Central Executive Committee of October 27, 1924, entitled "The Delimitation of the Soviet Republics in Central Asia and the Admission of the Uzbek Soviet Socialist Republic and the Turkmenian Soviet Socialist Republic to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics". The Uzbek SSR included the newly formed Tajik ASSR, the RSFSR included the Kara-Kirghiz Autonomous Region, and the Kazakh ASSR, which at the time was part of the RSFSR, included the Kara-Kalpak Autonomous Region.

Finally, it was none other than Faizulla Hojayevev who first brought up the question of national territorial delimitation in Central Asia.

Disproving the lies of anti-Soviet writers to the effect that national territorial delimitation in Central Asia was nothing more than a subtle variant of the "divide and rule" policy, we should like to quote Faizulla Hojayevev again. To begin with it should be said that he was one of the initiators of this historical act.¹ He repeatedly substantiated the need to do so. The press alone carried over a dozen of his articles on this issue.² And, finally, his views were absolutely unequivocal. For example, he qualified the national territorial delimitation of Central Asia as the "best example of the Communist Party's policy on the national question".³ Addressing the Second Session of the Central Executive Committee of the USSR on October 27, 1924, Faizulla Hojayevev characterised this measure in the following words: "This decision, first taken after the Revolution, satisfies the national aspirations of all peoples who for centuries had been oppressed by their own khans and emirs and by Russian capital, by Rus-

¹ Faizulla Hojayevev, *op. cit.*, p. 50.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 494 and 497.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 357.

sian imperialism. This decision of the Fifth All-Bukhara Congress is of an historical importance. Furthering the complete liberation of all peoples from any national oppression it will bring about still greater unity which is particularly essential in Central Asia for the organisation of the economy, for the struggle to raise the cultural level of the masses.

"That is why the session of the Turkestan Central Executive Committee, meeting the wishes of the toiling masses of Turkestan has decided to carry through a national territorial delimitation of the Turkestan Republic, just as the Congress of Soviets of the Khorezm Republic has decided to do. . . . The last vestiges of the rule of the emir and of Russia's imperialism will disappear, because all artificial boundaries which had been defined neither on the basis of economic nor national features will be abolished."⁴

Delimitation conducted along these lines has made it possible first to adjust the administrative boundaries in line with the settlement of the main nationalities and nations of Central Asia; second, it ensured their territorial integrity; third, it led to the creation of the national statehood for these nationalities and nations; fourth, it ensured fuller national sovereignty for the Central Asian peoples, and, finally, it enabled them to play a vigorous, and, what is most important, a rational and effective part in carrying through the nation-wide political, economic and cultural measures designed to promote socialist and communist construction in conditions of the strengthening friendship and the drawing together of the peoples of the USSR.

In the spring of 1925, the two newly formed republics joined the USSR, voluntarily transferring some of their sovereign powers, those specified in Article 14 of the All-Union Constitution, to the Union in the person of its central bodies.

By agreement between the Third Congress of Soviets of the Uzbek SSR (May 1929) and the Second Congress of Soviets of the Tajik ASSR (April 1929), the representative bodies of the national states of the Uzbek and Tajik peoples,

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 356-66.

the Khojent Region with a population of 250,000 was united with the Tajik Republic.

The swift political, economic and cultural development of the Tajik ASSR enabled the Third All-Tajik Congress of Soviets (October 16, 1929) to adopt a Declaration on the transformation of the Tajik ASSR into the Tajik Soviet Socialist Republic. The Declaration was approved at the Third Session of the USSR Central Executive Committee on December 5, 1929.

Kara-Kalpakia, which in 1930 became a part of the RSFSR, was transformed into an autonomous republic within the RSFSR on March 20, 1932. In 1936, it became a part of the Uzbek SSR. Thus the historically formed territorial proximity, the common destiny and the language and cultural kinship of the Uzbeks and Kara-Kalpaks were legislatively consolidated.

Kara-Kirghiz Autonomous Region, which on May 25, 1925, was renamed the Kirghiz Autonomous Region, on February 1, 1926, became the Kirghiz Autonomous Republic by decision of the USSR Central Executive Committee. In 1936, Kirghizia was proclaimed Kirghiz Soviet Socialist Republic, one of the constituent republics of the USSR.

Thus, the victory of socialism was marked by the creation of four national Union Republics, one autonomous republic and the Gorno-Badakhshan Autonomous Region. The self-determination of the working people of Central Asia was supplemented by their national self-determination, that is the creation of their national states which, regardless of their forms, appeared as a result of the free expression of the will of the people of each given state (national)-political unit. This essential condition of national statehood arises from the principle of self-determination of peoples.

One of the most important results of this stage of self-determination has been the rise of the Uzbek, Tajik, Kirghiz, Turkmen and Kara-Kalpak socialist nations on the basis of the victory of socialist relations of production, the cultural revolution, mutual assistance of the fraternal peoples, the spread and development of Marxist ideology into a genuinely material force and guidance on the part of the Communist Party.

Why does the national territorial delimitation in Central Asia, as an element of the self-determination of the Central Asian peoples, elicit malicious attacks by imperialist "critics" who advance absurd accusations of "dismemberment of Turkestan"? Once again the reason is that peoples, say the peoples of Africa, are attracted by the example of the Central Asian nations.

It is common knowledge that the borders which the young African states inherited from colonialism conform neither to ethnic or tribal principles nor to natural boundaries. The Malinké people in Western Africa, for example, have been split up among eight states. Today practically any African state could lay territorial claims on its neighbour, for when in the past the invaders carved up Africa into colonies they did so according to their strength. In some cases territorial disputes led to bloody clashes between young states: in October 1963, there was a conflict between Morocco and Algeria, in February 1964—between Somalia and Ethiopia, later between Somalia and Kenya, and so forth.

Objectively, such a situation with the borders is a very dangerous form of neo-colonialism. Mutual territorial claims engender conflicts between young states at the time when their unity in opposing imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism is more urgent than ever.

The territorial division of tribal lands in Africa has become fertile soil for another form of neo-colonialism, one that is closely connected with tribalism, that is, lack of internal unity due to the large number of different ethnic groups and tribes in the states south of the Sahara. Internal strife secretly encouraged by the neo-colonialists leads to bloodshed. As a result of such clashes scores of thousands of people from the Bahutu and Batutsi tribes were killed in Ruanda-Urundi from 1959 to 1962 not without incitement by Belgium; about a million of the Hausa and Ibo people died in Nigeria in 1966 in clashes in this case not without the participation of Britain and the USA, and so forth.

These conflicts created the very serious problem of refugees in Africa. In the short period since the establishment of independent African states the number of refugees reached two million by 1971.

Evidently the advocates of Pan-Turkism and Pan-Islamism deplore that such an outcome of self-determination was impossible in Central Asia and are indignant with the national delimitation in that part of the USSR. By accusing the Soviet Government of "dismembering" Turkestan they hope to whitewash their bosses whose policy has led to sanguinary clashes between the African peoples.

And so, the self-determination of the Central Asian peoples took place on the basis of generally accepted principles of international law. Moreover, it was the highest national form of self-determination, it was the self-determination of the working people. That is why it has been attacked by the "critics" in the service of imperialist propaganda. They, and primarily those of them who had donned the mantle of Pan-Turkism, should recall the words of Atatürk. Speaking on March 3, 1922 about the significance of the October Revolution, he said:

"This revolution has caught the eye and the attention of all unfortunate and downtrodden people. Russia has shown them how to cast off oppression and bondage. Russian revolutionaries granted freedom and self-determination to all nationalities which had languished under the tsarist regime in the former vast tsarist empire. They considered it necessary to respect the independence, rights and freedom of peoples."¹

¹ Archives, USSR Ministry for Foreign Affairs (in Russian).

7. IMPERIALIST EFFORTS TO STIFLE THE NATIONAL LIBERATION MOVEMENT OF THE CENTRAL ASIAN PEOPLES

The initial phase of the self-determination of the Central Asian peoples disclosed who were their friends and their foes. Their self-determination became possible thanks to the all-round support of the Russian proletariat and for that matter of the proletariat of the whole of Russia consisting of people of different nationalities. In their turn the successes of the Central Asian peoples in their struggle for self-determination reinforced the socialist revolution in Turkestan and throughout the former tsarist empire.

Having first appeared in those years the close bonds and mutual assistance of the main contingents of the revolutionary movement in the fight against colonial domination and capitalist oppression have become typical of the current epoch.

While the proletariat of Russia, and primarily the entire Russian working class, led by the Bolsheviks, considered its humane and class duty to help the working people of Central Asia in their struggle for liberation and self-determination, the local exploiter classes and external reactionaries acted in a different way.

The transition of power to the Soviets put an end not only to tsarist rule and the domination of the Russian bourgeoisie, but also terminated the rule of the local feudal lords and the wealthy commercial money-lending bourgeoisie. The exploiter classes formed an alliance in an effort to overthrow Soviet power in Central Asia. They intensified their propa-

ganda of Pan-Turkism and Pan-Islamism and galvanised their efforts to give concrete organisational shape to these trends with the view to splitting up the international front of the working people.

Now that there was no Russian Empire to support them, the local exploiters established and developed their co-operation with the local whiteguards, and also sought support abroad—from Pan-Turkic and Pan-Islamic circles in the neighbouring Asian states who had always had Britain's support in the inter-imperialist struggle against tsarism. This led to the establishment of social and political links between the local feudal compradores and the commercial money-lending national bourgeoisie, on the one hand, and the external colonial-imperialist front on the other in the fight against the national liberation and social emancipation of the Turkestan peoples.

The national liberation movement came up against the treachery of the local exploiter classes. The internal reaction and imperialism, primarily British, formed an anti-national, anti-popular alliance. Incidentally, those who are now so concerned about Islam and "Central Asian Muslims" prefer to hush up the fact that in those difficult years the Central Asian peoples had to uphold their right to self-determination in a struggle against a motley array of forces, some of which embraced Islam and some different branches of Christianity. All of them were united by their class hatred for the forces that fought for the national liberation and social emancipation of the Central Asian peoples.

To offset the international class alliance of the reactionary forces the oppressed nations of Central Asia and other parts of the former tsarist empire consolidated their internationalist unity.

Supported by their allies, primarily by the Russian proletariat, the Central Asian peoples continued to fight to consummate their self-determination and consolidate their gains. The international alliance of the internal reaction and imperialism openly tried to prevent them from doing so. The British imperialists promptly joined the struggle against the national and political liberation and socio-economic emancipation of the Central Asian peoples.

Isabel Brown, the wife of E. Brown, one of the founders of the Communist Party of Great Britain, recalling how her husband presented the banner of the Yorkshire workers to the delegates of the First Congress of Soviets of Uzbekistan, made the following, historically truthful observation: "It was to mark the support of the British working class for the victorious Soviet power, in contrast to British imperialist support for the counter-revolutionary force, that he presented the banner to the 13th Corps" (of the Red Army—*Ed.*).¹

The "critics" should bear this in mind.

In 1933, Bruno Yasensky, a well-known Soviet writer, addressed the following words full of sarcasm to Colonel Bailey of the British Intelligence: "History knows about the exploits of your compatriots in Baku and the Far North during the Civil War, but it knows too little about their fruitful activity in Central Asia."²

Of late Soviet historians have been devoting considerable attention to the entire question of Britain's anti-Soviet aggression in Central Asia, her policy towards this region and to the role and place of this policy in Soviet-British relations. So far, however, their work in this field is still in its initial stage.

In June 1918, the British Military Headquarters in Simla ordered General Malleon to lead an expedition of British troops consisting of light cavalry units and infantry into northeastern Iran. In July, he reached Meshed, and in August 1918, his troops invaded the Transcaspian part of Central Asia.

The British Government's official excuse was that the invasion of General Malleon's force into Soviet Central Asia and the presence in Tashkent of Bailey's military mission, which was engaged in espionage, were dictated by the need to prevent "subversive activity" and avert a possible German-Turkish drive towards India. This version is still repeated with varying details in memoirs and special literature.

¹ *Morning Star*, January 16, 1968.

² Bruno Yasensky, *Selected Works*, Vol. 2, Moscow, 1967, p. 53 (in Russian).

In actual fact, General Malleson's expeditionary force was outfitted for a much more specific purpose—to overthrow Soviet power which the people had established in Central Asia and seize this part of the former tsarist Russia. The principal objective was to get rid of the Bolsheviks, while the destiny of the Central Asian peoples, according to the plans of the British imperialists, could be decided by striking a deal with the local rulers.

What were the objectives of this military-political venture, in the words of those who took a direct part in it? General Dunsterville, for instance, said the following about General Malleson's mission: "From Krasnovodsk the railway runs to Ashkhahad and Merv, and a strong Bolshevik force was operating in the neighbourhood of Merv, against which a mission under General Malleson had been sent which was moving north from Meshed on to this railway."¹ The British spy Colonel Bailey who was in charge of subversive activity against Soviet power in Tashkent, was even more laconic. He said that Malleson's mission was to put an end to the Bolshevik regime in Turkestan.² Colonel Tod, commander of the British forces fighting against the Red Army at Bairam-Ali, Kaakhka and elsewhere wrote that the objective of the British command was to "clear the Bolsheviks out of Turkestan".³ And here is an admission by colonel of the tsarist army I. Zaitsev, Chief of Staff of the counter-revolutionary Turkestan Military Organisation, which worked in close contact with the British mission in Tashkent: "The actual objectives and intentions of the mission were to prepare and organise armed uprisings in Turkestan against Soviet power and to supply the insurgents with money and weapons from the British bases nearest to Turkestan (Meshed, Kashgar, Afghanistan)."⁴

¹ Lionel Ch. Dunsterville, *The Adventures of Dunsterforce*, London, 1932, p. 178.

² F. M. Bailey, *Mission to Tashkent*, London, 1946, p. 192.

³ J. K. Tod, "Operations in Transcaspia, 1918-1919", *The Army Quarterly*, July 1928, London, No. 2, p. 296.

⁴ I. Z., "Reminiscences", *Solovetskiye Isles*, 1926, No. 4, p. 62.

In July 1917, the Provisional Government placed the White Cossack Colonel Zaitsev in command of the Russian troops in Khiva where he brutally crushed an uprising raised by Turkmenians. In January 1918,

An active participant in the counter-revolutionary activity in Central Asia the Frenchman Castagné admitted that the purpose of the joint forces of the British and internal reaction was to overthrow Soviet power in Turkestan and to turn it over to British imperialism.¹

Finally, we could quote from an official document, an agreement between General Malleson and the Ashkhahad Socialist-Revolutionary and Menshevik government of August 19, 1918,² which he signed on behalf of the British Government after it had approved the text.³ Articles 1, 2(b), 5 and 8 unequivocally stated that British assistance would be provided for the struggle against "Bolshevism" and "Bolshevik troops".

The following facts likewise refute the assertion that Britain's intervention in Transcaucasia and Central Asia had been dictated by the need to fight against Turkey and Germany. Although Turkey capitulated on October 30, and Germany conceded her defeat in the First World War on November 11, 1918, the British troops occupied Baku for a second time on November 17, 1918 and also seized Transcaucasia. Though the armistice in Compiègne was signed and the First World War was over, British naval vessels remained in the Caspian Sea and turned their guns on Soviet shipping and coastal areas, and the British land forces were conducting military operations with the view to overthrowing Soviet power there.

It was by no means an accident, therefore, that in November 1918 the US magazine *Dial* wrote that now when

he moved his troops to link up with the counter-revolutionary forces of the "Kokand Autonomy". But he was stopped and routed by Soviet units at Samarkand. His Cossacks were disarmed but he managed to make good his escape. Later Zaitsev was arrested and imprisoned. But he broke out of jail with the help of the Turkestan Military Organisation and became its chief of staff. In 1919, he succeeded in making his way to Dutov who appointed him chief of staff. Later he fled with Dutov to China. In 1924, he returned to the USSR and gave himself up to the authorities.

¹ J. Castagné, *Les Basmachis*, Paris, 1925, pp. 20, 25.

² For the complete text of the agreement see: *Turkmenistan in the Period of the Foreign Intervention and the Civil War of 1919-1920*, pp. 93-96 (in Russian).

³ *Soviet Affairs*, London, 1959, No. 2, p. 136.

Germany had been defeated, the time had come to pose the question: "What are our plans with regard to Russia?" The reply came in the form of a treaty on joint actions against the Soviet Government signed in January 1919 by Britain, France and the USA, on the one hand, and Admiral Kolchak, on the other. Both internal and external reaction dreamed of overthrowing Soviet power.

All this shows that the actual objective of the invasion of the British forces into Transcaspia had nothing in common with the official explanation offered by the British Government.

General Malleon frankly said that the crossing of the Soviet-Iranian border by his troops was an act of war against the Bolsheviks.¹ What bourgeois writers call Malleon's "mission" was in effect an unprovoked aggressive war launched from the territory of Iran.

Prior to invading Transcaspia, General Malleon's military mission, while still in Iran, got in touch with the counter-revolutionary forces operating in the Ashkhabad underground and also the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks (Dokhov, Dorer and others)² who had fled to Iran and hatched an anti-Soviet conspiracy in Ashkhabad. Later Malleon wrote that he was in close contact with some Russian Social-Democratic elements in Turkestan.³ On July 12, 1918, the Socialist-Revolutionaries and the Mensheviks seized power through a counter-revolutionary coup. They set up their own "government"—an executive committee headed by

¹ W. Malleon, "The British Military Mission to Turkestan 1918-20", *Journal of the Central Asian Society*, 1922, pp. 11, 98.

² Even some patriotically-minded tsarist officers regarded this as an act of treason on the part of the Socialist-Revolutionaries. V. Travinsky in his "Red Flag over Kushka" (in Russian) published in the magazine *Znaniya* (No. 2, 1967) recounts the following episode. Being short of weapons the Transcaspian "government" sent its representative Count Dorer to Kushka fortress which had the biggest arms dump in Turkestan. At its meeting the Kushka garrison, which had sided with Soviet power from the first days of the October Revolution, decided "not to give any weapons to the mutineers". The fortress commander tsarist Lieutenant-General Vostrosablin supported his men and declared that being a Russian he would not support the British-backed Ashkhabad "government".

³ W. Malleon, *op cit.*, p. 97.

the Socialist-Revolutionary Funtikov—and shortly extended their rule to Krasnovodsk, Kzyl-Arvat and other cities in Transcaspia.

On July 29, 1918, the so-called Socialist-Revolutionary executive committee decided to begin talks with the British with the view to securing their "assistance" and sent one of its members Dokhov to Malleon.¹ On August 3, the British accompanied by Dokhov arrived in Ashkhabad for talks with the Socialist-Revolutionaries headed by Funtikov.²

The executive committee's decision to "invite" the British and their talks with them were mere fiction. Knowing that they would be unable to hold on to Transcaspia with the hands of the Socialist-Revolutionaries and the Mensheviks, the British ordered their troops to cross the Soviet frontier before the talks were over and a week in advance of the conclusion of their agreement with the Socialist-Revolutionaries and the Mensheviks. On August 12, 1918, the British troops invaded Transcaspia and their first unit was transferred by the Central Asian Railway to the Bairam-Ali defensive line held by the whiteguards.³

The Socialist-Revolutionary and Menshevik "government" represented no one and relied wholly on British arms.⁴ But it was a convenient screen for the aggression of the British who were planning to seize Turkestan.

Britain's intentions were reflected in the above-mentioned agreement which was designed to shroud the aggression already committed by the British. The two "sides" formulated the following tasks (and thus intended to give them legal justification): the overthrow of Soviet power in Transcaspia and in the whole of Turkestan⁵ (Articles 1, 2b and d, 5, 8).

¹ "Report of the Foreign Minister of the Transcaspian Government to the Representative of the Command of the Armed Forces of the South of Russia General Erdeli", *Foreign Intervention*, Document No. 315 (in Russian).

² T. S. Kozlov, "The British in Transcaspia", *Turkmenian Studies*, Ashkhabad, 1928, Nos. 7-8, p. 35 (in Russian).

³ S. P. Timoshkov, *The Fight Against the British Intervention in Turkestan*, 1941, p. 39.

⁴ *Foreign Intervention*, Document No. 315 (in Russian).

⁵ In this agreement Turkestan is referred to as Russian Turkestan (Article 1a) (in Russian).

The British were to take over Krasnovodsk on the Caspian Sea so as to turn it into a naval base and "defend" it against attacks by Turko-German or Bolshevik forces. Thus the British were to have a free hand on the Caspian. The Socialist-Revolutionaries pledged to "give the British every assistance in exploiting the railway", to destroy it and drive away the rolling stock in the event of an emergency, to repair the Meshed-Ashkhabad motor road, prevent the shipment of cotton out of Transcaspia, and so forth.

In return the British pledged to "defend Krasnovodsk (and Baku) from the Bolsheviks" and assigned weapons, advisers and soldiers for this purpose. Moreover, they promised to give the Socialist-Revolutionaries financial and extensive military assistance "so long as the Transcaspian government," as the agreement emphasised, "makes the restoration of order and the suppressing of all Bolshevik and Turko-German intrigues and aggressive intentions the corner-stone of its political programme".¹

The testimony of the direct participants in Britain's aggressive actions in Transcaspia shows that the British regarded this "agreement" as a formal basis for operations against Soviet Turkestan. General Malleon, for instance, admitted later that if necessary Turkestan's economic artery—the Central Asian Railway—would have been turned over to the British.² Colonel Tod, who was with Malleon, wrote: "A condition of British assistance in the defence of the province (Transcaspia—R. T.) was that the Mission should be given a free hand to deal with the Central Asian Railway as it thought fit."³ In the event of retreat the British command intended to take advantage of the agreement to destroy the oilfields in the area, the Krasnovodsk port and the railway.⁴

Having opened the door to Transcaspia for the British the Socialist-Revolutionaries and the Mensheviks help-

¹ *Turkmenistan in the Period of the Foreign Intervention and the Civil War of 1919-1920*, p. 33 (in Russian).

² W. Malleon, *The British Military Mission to Turkestan*, 1918-20, p. 97.

³ J. K. Tod, "Operations in Transcaspia, 1918-1919", *The Army Quarterly*, London, July 1928, No. 2, p. 283.

⁴ W. Malleon, op. cit., p. 99; J. K. Tod, op. cit., p. 283.

ed them in their struggle against Soviet power in Turkestan.

Some British attempt to minimise the significance of British aggression against Soviet Turkestan by referring, among other things, to the small number of the British troops involved.¹

They say, for instance, that there was only a 350-strong British force in Central Asia at first and that by the evacuation date it numbered no more than 950 men.² Though of secondary importance, it should nevertheless be noted that the British command did not expect to encounter "armed to the teeth" Bolsheviks in Transcaspia, since it knew that Soviet power there, and for that matter in the whole of Central Asia, was not propped by Russian military strength, as is still being asserted by some people in Britain who are bent on slandering the Soviet Union. For emphasising the truth, it should be noted that the British had a considerably larger number of troops in Central Asia than they admit. For example, from 950 to 1,000 British troops took part in the battle at Dushak (October 14, 1918) alone.

In December 1918, representatives of the Socialist-Revolutionary and Menshevik "government", Volnin and Captain Solomandin, and a British Captain, reported to members of the whiteguard centre in Omsk that an infantry battalion, an artillery battery and a machine-gun squad were stationed in Krasnovodsk, as part of the British forces operating in Transcaspia. Two British infantry battalions, a cavalry force numbering over a regiment in strength, an artillery battery and a machine-gun squad were in action against Soviet troops along the Merv-Kushka line. British units elements were also deployed at all more or less important stations along the Central Asian Railway from Krasnovodsk to Anenkovo. Eyewitnesses put the number of troops in Ashkhabad at 250 infantry and a cavalry squadron.³

¹ C. H. Ellis, "Operations in Transcaspia 1918-1919 and the 26 Commissars Case", London, *Soviet Affairs*, No. 2, 1959; by the same author, *The Transcaspian Episode, 1918-1919*, London, 1963.

² C. H. Ellis, "Operations in Transcaspia...", *Soviet Affairs*, No. 2, 1959, p. 159.

³ J. K. Tod, "Operations in Transcaspia, 1918-1919", *The Army Quarterly*, p. 296.

It would, therefore, be reasonable to say that the number of British troops was much greater than officially stated. In December 1918, there were at least 3,000 troops. Acting foreign minister of the Transcaspian "government" reported to his whiteguard command that by mid-January 1919 there were "about 2,000 infantry and cavalry at the front, primarily in Merv, 550 in Ashkhabad and 800 in Krasnovodsk".¹

Having failed to win the support of the people, the Socialist-Revolutionary and Menshevik executive committee gradually became unnecessary to the British and on January 1, 1919, Funtikov's "government" dissolved itself, or to be precise, it was disbanded by the British. It was replaced by a five-man directory, an obedient tool of the British command. General Malleson established the institute of military governors, typical of the British colonies. Through the numerous agents whom these governors recruited from among the local nationalists, and also through the British spy Bailey operating in Tashkent, General Malleson's headquarters established close contact with all major counter-revolutionary forces in Central Asia, including the Turkestan Military Organisation, *basmachi* bands, whiteguard generals and the rulers of Bukhara and Khiva. These forces placed their hopes on British support and assistance in their fight against Soviet power, while the British planned to use them to further their own interests.

Later Malleson boasted that he was very well informed about the situation in Turkestan and had a large number of his agents in the Bolshevik administration.²

Established in the spring of 1918 the counter-revolutionary Turkestan Military Organisation headed by the former commandant of Petersburg General Junkovsky united not only whiteguard officers and the local Russian bourgeois, but also local merchants, capitalists and bourgeois nationalists. By the summer of 1918, it created so-called "centres of struggle" in Krasnovodsk, Ashkhabad, Khiva, Bukhara, Kokand, Samarkand, Aulea-Ata and other cities.³ It entered

¹ *Foreign Intervention*, Document No. 315, p. 368.

² W. Malleson, *The British Military Mission to Turkestan, 1918-20*, p. 106.

³ J. Castagné, *Les Basmachis*, Paris, 1925, p. 20.

into contact with the local counter-revolutionary nationalistic circles, Ferghana *basmachi*, Turkmenian chieftains, Junaid-Khan's bands and the Emir of Bukhara, and established contact with the British command, first with Dunsterville and then with Malleson, even prior to the British invasion of Transcaspia. The Turkestan Military Organisation was financed by the British through their military command in Meshed and their consulate in Kashgar.¹

Upon his arrest by the Soviet authorities P. Nazarov, a member of this organisation who was promised the post of head of government in the protectorate which the British intended to establish on the territory of present-day Central Asia, testified that at the end of August 1918 Junkovsky sent him 100,000 rubles for the needs of the Turkestan Military Organisation from Malleson's headquarters in Meshed.²

The British command intended to supply 25,000 rifles, 40 machine-guns and 16 mountain guns to the Turkestan Organisation.³

Early in 1918, the British established close links with Bukhara and determinately supported the Emir. They encouraged his anti-Soviet policy in every way regarding the Bukhara army as a potential threat to the Turkestan flank of the Red Army.⁴

Inciting the Emir to launch an attack on Soviet Turkestan General Malleson assured him that Bukhara would have full British support.⁵ And British weapons and uniforms were sent to Bukhara.

In the autumn of 1918, the Emir appointed a permanent representative to the British headquarters and at the beginning of 1919, in connection with the deteriorating situation in Bukhara itself, instructed his special representatives to negotiate the entry of British forces into Bukhara.⁶

¹ I. Z., "Reminiscences", *Solovetskiye Isles*, 1926, No. 4, p. 64.

² *Foreign Intervention*, Document No. 62.

³ I. Z., "Reminiscences", *Solovetskiye Isles*, 1926, No. 4, 68.

⁴ C. H. Ellis, op. cit., p. 148.

⁵ B. I. Iskanderov, "Britain's Preparation of the Bukhara Springboard for Intervention in Soviet Turkestan, 1918-1920", *Historical Notes*, Vol. 36, Moscow, 1951, p. 41 (in Russian).

⁶ Ibid., p. 43.

British officers were attached to some military units of the Bukhara forces, and both Malleon and the Emir were satisfied at the time: the British general was pleased with the way British assistance was used, and the Emir with the nature of this assistance. In the summer of 1919, they exchanged messages of gratitude.¹

Britain, likewise, furnished every support to the counter-revolutionary forces in Khiva. "With British assistance Bukhara and Khiva have turned into hotbeds of the most overt anti-Soviet reaction. The Emir of Bukhara and the Khan of Khiva were vigorously preparing for an armed struggle against Soviet power."²

The threads of the counter-revolutionary uprising launched by Osipov in Tashkent in January 1919 also led to the British command through the Emir of Bukhara. Preparing the uprising Osipov sent his liaison men Lieutenant Bobchinsky, a member of the Turkestan Military Organisation, and a certain Mashkov with information for Malleon. They had a confidential letter from the British consul to the general.

The British command guided and directly participated in effecting one of the biggest plans designed to end Soviet power in Turkestan. In keeping with the plan, which was worked out in August 1918, all counter-revolutionary forces were to strike out simultaneously from all sides and cut off Soviet Turkestan from Central Russia. The operation was to be carried out by Ataman Dutov's detachments, units of the Ashkhabad front, insurgent *basmachi* bands which were being raised in Ferghana, Junaid-Khan's band, bands from Aulea-Ata and the troops of the Bukhara Emirate. Colonel Zaitsev, who took part in drawing up the plan, later wrote: "The British command approved the plan and sent messengers with corresponding instructions to Dutov."³ But the plan was not carried out to the end. Soviet power proved to be more stable than the leaders of the counter-revolution had imagined.

¹ A. I. Ishanov, *Victory of the People's Soviet Revolution in Bukhara*, Tashkent, 1957, p. 12 (in Russian).

² A. H. Babahodjayev, *Failure of the British Aggressive Policy in Central Asia, 1917-1920*, Tashkent, 1955, p. 50.

³ I. Z., "Reminiscences", *Solovetskiye Isles*, 1926, No. 4, p. 69.

The eight-month sway of the British in Transcaspia (August 1918 to March 1919) was one of unceasing outrages and acts of violence. They staged provocations and carried out brutal reprisals against active fighters for Soviet power among the workers and peasants and against Communists. At the Dushak railway station they massacred the personnel of a Soviet hospital and 200 wounded Red Army men. They sanctioned and took part in plundering and razing the town of Tejan murdering its inhabitants, including old men, women and children. They perpetrated and provoked massacres in Kazanjik, Kzyl-Arvat and other towns in Transcaspia.¹

The British command was directly responsible for the brutal assassination of the 26 Baku commissars, although British writers are still endeavouring to absolve it of this crime. When the commissars were arrested in Krasnovodsk their fate was discussed by Malleon and the "commissar for foreign affairs" of the Socialist-Revolutionary and Menshevik "government" in Ashkhabad Dokhov. Malleon argued that it was "dangerous" to move the commissars to Turkestan.² Later, approving their execution, he admitted: "It was clear that the arrival of such a group in Ashkhabad had to be prevented at all costs. Therefore, the representatives of the Transcaspian whiteguard government agreed that 'only dead Bolsheviks were not dangerous'."³ The puppets interpreted this view of the dictator of Transcaspia as an order to execute them. The representative of the British command in Ashkhabad Captain R. T. Jones admitted that the British had directly sanctioned the execution of the 26 commissars.⁴

This fact is borne out in articles and in a book written by eyewitness V. Chaikin.⁵ Attempts are being made to

¹ A. H. Babahodjayev, op. cit.; Y. Alexerov, *Intervention and the Civil War in Central Asia*; S. P. Timoshkov, *The Fight Against British Intervention in Turkestan* (all in Russian).

² C. H. Ellis, op. cit.

³ Quoted from A. H. Babahodjayev, op. cit., p. 78.

⁴ T. S. Kozlov, op. cit., p. 41.

⁵ Articles were published in February and April 1919 in Baku in the *Znamya Truda* and *Yedinaya Rossiya* newspapers and the book *History of the Russian Revolution. Execution of the 26 Baku Commissars* was published in Moscow, in 1922.

dispute his testimony on the grounds that he arrived on the spot after the tragic events had already taken place.¹ A collection of reminiscences of people who had participated in the operations against the British forces in Transcaspia or who at the time were on the territory occupied by units of the Socialist-Revolutionary "government", was published in Ashkhabad in 1937. The authors relate that when members of the Krasnovodsk "strike committee" asked their chairman who had arrested the commissars about their destiny he replied that whatever happened to them the responsibility would rest not only with the Ashkhabad "government" but with the British command, too.² The head of the Socialist-Revolutionary "government" Funtikov later said that the secret shooting of the commissars was carried out at the insistence of the British.³ "The representative of the British Mission in Ashkhabad R. T. Jones," Funtikov wrote in his testimony following his arrest, "told me before the execution, as Druzhkin (chief of the investigation bureau of the Socialist-Revolutionary "government"—R.T.) had also done, that the commissars had to be shot, and then expressed his satisfaction that they had been shot in keeping with the intentions of the British Mission."⁴

Murder, violence and even forcible deportation of people from Transcaspia to India⁵—all these things had nothing to do with the objectives and tasks which, according to bourgeois writers, the Malleon "mission" was seeking in Transcaspia.

On October 21, 1918, the Central Executive Committee of the Turkestan Republic sent a cable to Moscow, the local Soviets and military headquarters, listing the atrocities perpetrated by the British troops and facts of violation of the principles of international law by the British command.

¹ C. H. Ellis, op. cit., p. 145.

² *Articles and Reminiscences of the Participants in the Civil War in Turkmenia* (in Russian).

³ Ibid., p. 50.

⁴ Ibid., p. 49; V. Chaikin, op. cit., p. 183.

⁵ There were 65 registered cases of people being deported out of Transcaspia to India on orders from the British command. See: *Who Is the Debtor?* p. 349 (in Russian).

In it the Central Executive Committee protested against the invasion of Turkestan by British forces and their "outrageous methods of warfare and interference into the internal affairs of the republic".¹ It also requested support for its protest before the governments of all civilised countries and to inform the proletariat of Europe and America.

Further, the cable stated: "Taking urgent measures to defend the republic, the Turkestan Central Executive Committee has decided that unless Britain alters her policy with regard to Turkestan within a period of seven days and unless the All-Russia Central Executive Committee or the Council of People's Commissars issues special decrees supporting the protest, it will enforce the following measures: first, all citizens of the Entente states will be placed under surveillance; second, all British subjects will be held as hostages pending the withdrawal of troops from Turkestan; third, steps will be taken to abolish or restrict the property rights of the above foreigners in Turkestan; fourth, these measures will not be extended to official representatives and foreigners who have shown their goodwill towards Soviet power."²

Formulating the measures set forth in the second point of the decision the Turkestan Central Executive Committee proceeded from the fact that Britain was waging an aggressive war against Soviet Turkestan, and that she was the first to resort to holding Soviet citizens and truce emissaries as hostages.³ The measures listed in the first and third points were necessary because representatives of the Entente countries were to support British aggression not only because of class motives but also on the strength of their allied commitments to Britain; Soviet authorities knew about the anti-Soviet subversive activity carried on by the citizens of the Entente countries in Turkestan, particularly their extensive support for the local bourgeois-nationalist and whiteguard counter-revolution.

On the whole the measures proposed by the Turkestan Central Executive Committee were inadequate to put com-

¹ A. H. Babahodjayev, op. cit., p. 86.

² Ibid.

³ C. H. Ellis, op. cit., p. 143; F. M. Bailey, *Mission to Tashkent*, p. 67; *Who Is the Debtor?*, p. 349.

plete end to the intrigues by imperialism and internal counter-revolution. In a reply cable the People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs of the RSFSR said that they should be supplemented by the following measures:

"To intern all citizens of the former allied powers from 17 to 48 years of age, excluding women, children and workers who accept our platform...; suspend all payments to the British and their allies; arrest all official representatives and confiscate their correspondence.... Adopt decisive measures with regard to all persons maintaining ties with the British and their allies.¹

These were legitimate steps, nevertheless, the Soviet authorities in Turkestan did not enforce the measures listed in the first and second points of the decision of the Turkestan Central Executive Committee until the very last moment. In a cable of August 23, 1918, that is, when the British troops had already launched their aggression in Transcaspia, Lenin recommended the Chairman of the Turkestan Council of People's Commissars to adopt a temporising policy with regard to ambassadors and consuls.²

At the end of October 1918, the Turkestan Cheka³ uncovered the Turkestan Military Organisation and disclosed its ties with the British command from which it was getting support.⁴

It was only after the plot had been uncovered that the Turkestan Central Executive Committee, in order to cut short the subversive and espionage activity of the representatives of the Entente countries, ordered to intern British, French, US and Italian citizens, place them under surveillance, suspend all payments to them and to arrest and keep in custody the official representatives and employees of the governments of these states.

In Transcaspia the British continued to behave as though they were at home. In January 1919, the British commander established his dictatorship in the region. The slightest

¹ *Foreign Intervention*, Document No. 63, pp. 84-85 (in Russian).

² *Lenin Miscellany*, Vol. XXXIV, pp. 41-42 (in Russian).

³ Cheka—All-Russia Extraordinary Commission for combating counter-revolution, sabotage and profiteering.

⁴ *Nasha Gazeta*, October 29, 1918.

attempt on the part of the population to express their will was immediately crushed. In an order published in the local counter-revolutionary sheet *Golos Srednei Azii*, Malleson banned all meetings, gatherings and rallies in Ashkhabad and threatened to use British arms to disperse them.

The British shipped oil, cotton, wool and karakul out of Transcaspia. Their plunder and the economic dislocation led to inflation whose catastrophic dimensions forced General Malleson in November 1918 to put promissory notes of the British command into circulation. He pledged on behalf of the British Government that the sum specified in the notes would be repayed within three months of issue. But this took place later and not all the money was returned. This was a convenient means of plundering Transcaspia. With the Transcaspian "government" facing bankruptcy, General Malleson even had to put Indian rupees into circulation in the region in February 1919.

The position of the British forces was becoming less and less secure. Locally formed Red Army units dealt telling blows at the interventionists and the whiteguards. Partisan detachments operated in the rear of the interventionists harassing their lines of communications. In view of this British representatives, who were supplying weapons to *basmachi* detachments in Ferghana and urging the speediest possible formation of an assault counter-revolutionary group in Transcaspia, declared in October 1918 that the "Ashkhabad (anti-Soviet—R.T.) front was unreliable and would not last long, that by itself it had no serious military significance and could not have any impact on the future of the entire territory and that it was necessary to organise other centres of struggle with the utmost dispatch".¹

Planning to overthrow Soviet power in Central Asia the British imperialists attached major importance to the above-mentioned military and espionage mission led by Colonel Bailey of the Intelligence Service. His task was to see to it that the notorious conspiracy of the ambassadors headed by Robert Lockhart would be extended to Turkestan, too.² The

¹ I. Z., "Reminiscences", *Solovet'skiye Isles*, 1926, Nos. 5-6, p. 31.

² N. Y. Malstein, *From the History of the Turkestan Cheka*, Tashkent, 1965, p. 22 (in Russian).

first step in this plan to do away with Soviet power was to bring together all the counter-revolutionary forces in Soviet Turkestan and to set up a centre to guide their activities.

Bailey arrived in Tashkent on August 14, 1918¹ and immediately set to establishing ties with counter-revolutionary forces and then co-ordinating the operations of the Turkestan Military Organisation, Atanan Dutov's headquarters, *basmachi* chieftains and the Emir of Bukhara. "The experiences of this little known Mission," Colonel Tod wrote, "merit a volume to themselves."² In his reminiscences published in 1946, Bailey, however, deliberately says nothing about his efforts to unite the counter-revolutionary forces in Central Asia for the purpose of overthrowing Soviet power.³

Writing about his stay in Tashkent, Bailey tries to deny the existence of close ties between his secret mission and General Malleson's headquarters. In effect, however, they maintained very close ties. General Malleson even took steps to safeguard Bailey in the event of possible disclosure and arrest. He arrested two Soviet representatives, Babushkin, on whose life an attempt had been made in Kokand, and Afanasyev, as hostages for Bailey and the US Consul-General Tredwell in Tashkent who worked together with him. Bailey himself admits this fact.⁴

By doing so the British command not only disclosed its involvement in Bailey's activity in Tashkent, but conceded that it was of the kind which deserved arrest and severe punishment by the Soviet authorities. Incidentally, by keeping the two Soviet citizens as hostages the British violated elementary norms of warfare.

¹ Prior to his arrival in Tashkent Bailey was on an intelligence assignment in Southern Iran. In March 1918, he was summoned to Srinagarh, India, where he was ordered to go to Central Asia with Majors Etherton and Blacker who had already been there. On the way to Tashkent Etherton was appointed British Consul in Kashgar to succeed the Consul-General in Kashgar, Macartney, who went to Tashkent instead of him. On September 14, 1918, Blacker and Macartney left for India, while Bailey remained in Tashkent. Blacker and Etherton published their memoirs.

² J. K. Tod, "Operations in Transcaspia", *The Army Quarterly*, July 1928, No. 2, p. 284.

³ F. M. Bailey, *Mission to Tashkent*.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 196.

The existence of close contacts between Bailey and the British command is also borne out by the fact that he promised the leaders of the Turkestan Military Organisation actually in the name of the British headquarters in Meshed to supply it with enough weapons after the road from the central areas of Turkestan "to Meshed" was opened, and also to furnish armed assistance "from the northern provinces of Persia" if the need arises.¹ Further proof of this was the existence of a plan for co-ordinated action with the *basmachi* against Soviet power in Turkestan, which was worked out, as we have mentioned earlier, with the active participation of the Tashkent "mission" and approved by the British command. Moreover, in his reminiscences, Bailey often refers to his correspondence with the British command.²

Bailey appeared in Tashkent after the British had established close connections with the city's counter-revolutionary underground. The British maintained contact with the conspirators through their agents in Ashkhabad, Meshed and Kashgar. Bailey wrote that former British Consul-General in Kashgar, Macartney, went to Tashkent to "introduce and help the Mission with his great and valuable local knowledge and influence. . . . His influence and support proved invaluable to Blacker and me".³

During his 28 years in Kashgar Macartney often visited Tashkent, and after the October Revolution established firm contacts with local counter-revolutionary elements and with the representatives of other Western countries, mainly US agents, who supported them. The British and the Americans worked hand in glove.

In the spring of 1918, Tredwell was appointed US Consul-General in Tashkent.⁴ He had entered into contact with diverse counter-revolutionary organisations and anti-Soviet

¹ I. Z., "Reminiscences", *Solovetskiye Isles*, 1926, No. 4, pp. 62, 68.

² F. M. Bailey, *Mission to Tashkent*, pp. 196, 198, 248.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 54.

⁴ Tredwell's activity is described in: L. M. Land, *American Imperialism: Active Organiser of the Anti-Soviet Intervention in Central Asia (1918-1920)* (in Russian); *Works of the History of the Uzbek SSR Museum* (in Russian), Issue III, pp. 23-37; A. II. Babahodjayew, *op. cit.*; Y. Alexerov, *op. cit.*

elements who had infiltrated the Turkestan state apparatus. He was also closely associated with Bailey who later admitted that he and Tredwell had "a great deal in common".¹ It must be said that all Western representatives in Tashkent did have a "great deal in common"—their hatred for the October Revolution.

The appearance of a British imperialist agent in the capital of Soviet Turkestan stimulated the activity of the counter-revolutionary forces, and first and foremost of the Turkestan Military Organisation, their biggest centre at the time. Castagné, who knew Bailey well, wrote that the "greatest activity of this organisation coincided with the arrival of Colonel Bailey in Tashkent".²

The almost 3,000-strong Turkestan Military Organisation³ "came to a definite and final agreement with British government representatives", wrote Colonel Zaitsev.⁴ The Turkestan Military Organisation was to prepare and direct the simultaneous uprising of all its "centres of struggle" against Soviet power. The British Government, on its part, undertook to arm, supply and finance "all the armed forces designated for the struggle against Soviet power" and "should the need arise" promised "armed support from the northern provinces of Persia".⁵

After the counter-revolutionary coup it was planned to proclaim the establishment of the "Turkestan Democratic Republic" which would come under Britain's exclusive influence.

As payment for this "assistance" the leaders of the Turkestan Military Organisation promised on behalf of the future "republic" to grant the British "a number of concessions for developing the area's national resources".⁶

This was tantamount to turning Turkestan into a British colony. Castagné wrote in this connection that the leaders of the Turkestan Military Organisation headed by Junkovsky

¹ F. M. Bailey, *Mission to Tashkent*, p. 25.

² J. Castagné, *Les Basmatchis*, 1925, p. 20.

³ F. M. Bailey, *Mission to Tashkent*, p. 50.

⁴ I. Z., "Reminiscences", *Solovetskiye Isles*, 1926, No. 4, p. 62.

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ *Pravda*, November 10, 1922 and June 5, 1923.

agreed to the establishment of a 55-year long British protectorate over Turkestan.¹

After the unsuccessful uprising of the Ashkhabad Socialist-Revolutionaries, which had been planned to coincide with the uprisings of all "centres of struggle", the above-mentioned plan of encircling Soviet Turkestan with the united forces of the international and internal counter-revolution and of engineering an uprising was worked out with the direct participation of Bailey's group.² This plan was to be carried out in October 1918. The conspirators and foreign intelligence agents headed by Bailey attached paramount importance to the operations of Ataman Dutov's forces to whom they dispatched Lieutenant Papenhut as liaison officer.³

The new plan provided for the formation of a 25,000-strong insurgent force consisting of *basmachi* and the remnants of Russian whiteguard units in Ferghana, with Britain furnishing weapons and financial assistance.⁴ The plan designated the supply bases and two supply routes: (1) Chitral-Kashgar-Irkeshtam-Osh, and (2) Peshawar-Kabul-Bukhara. According to Zaitsev all assistance was to be forthcoming in adequate quantities whenever necessary. "The British promised to give 100 million rubles, 25,000 rifles, 40 machine-guns and 16 mountain guns."⁵ It was also agreed that the necessary funds would be delivered "through the local British Consul from Kashgar hanks".

The Turkestan Military Organisation intensified its contacts with Kashgar, and Bailey urged the plotters to speed up the formation of the insurgent force. To obtain a part of the money promised by the British, Lieutenant Bobchinsky with a special letter from Bailey was dispatched to Kashgar in the first half of October 1918.⁶

But Bailey failed in his mission to throttle Soviet power in Turkestan. Later he attributed this to the absence of reliable communication between the various counter-revolutionary

¹ J. Castagné, *Les Basmatchis*, Paris, 1925, p. 21.

² I. Z., "Reminiscences", *Solovetskiye Isles*, 1926, No. 4, p. 68.

³ J. Castagné, *Les Basmatchis*, p. 24.

⁴ I. Z., "Reminiscences", *Solovetskiye Isles*, 1926, No. 4, p. 68.

⁵ Ibid., and *Pravda*, November 10, 1922.

⁶ I. Z., "Reminiscences", *Solovetskiye Isles*, 1926, Nos. 4-5, p. 31.

forces whose actions he intended to co-ordinate, to the "extreme vigilance" of the Bolsheviks and also to the vigorous measures launched by the Soviet authorities to stamp out the counter-revolution.¹

It was neither foreign money nor foreign arms and not even armed aggression that decided the future of Turkestan. It was decided by the people who were on the side of Soviet power. Although in his reminiscences Bailey keeps quiet about the facts disclosing his intrigues and the activity of the British in Central Asia he nevertheless admits that anti-British sentiments were widespread in Turkestan, particularly in connection with the British armed intervention in Transcaspia, so much so that being in Tashkent, he was not sure that he would escape deserved punishment by the government or prevent the soldiers from taking the matter into their own hands.²

This spy and plotter who is living comfortably in his Norfolk estate is responsible for the death of many people. He is a criminal, although he is lauded as a hero in Britain. Many of his dark deeds have not been fully disclosed, for his anti-Soviet activity in Central Asia was indeed far-flung. In his service were counter-revolutionaries of all hues, including Kerensky's brother, the brother of General Kornilov, the illegitimate son of Grand Prince Nikolai Konstantinovich Captain Iskander, General Junkovsky and Colonel Zaitsev.

In 1967, Soviet journalist I. Andronov shed additional light on Bailey's dark past.³

Together with Malleson Bailey organised the counter-revolution in Turkestan and also supervised all measures aimed at preventing the establishment of friendly relations between the Soviet Republic and Afghanistan and Iran.

In 1919, Bailey made a vigorous attempt to neutralise and make short shrift of a delegation from the Provisional Government of Free India headed by member of the Indian National Congress Party Professor Barkatulla who together

¹ F. M. Bailey, *Mission to Tashkent*, p. 49.

² *Ibid.*, p. 81.

³ I. Andronov, "From the History of the Awakened East", *New Times*, 1967, Nos. 9-10 (in Russian).

with a delegation of Indian anti-colonial fighters was received by Lenin on May 7, 1919. Barkatulla conveyed to the Soviet Government the request of the Afghan authorities for assistance against British imperialism.¹

Bailey is responsible for the death of the first RSFSR Ambassador in Afghanistan N. Bravin who was stabbed in the back in Kabul.² In this connection Malleson wrote that their objective was to prevent the conclusion of an agreement between Afghanistan and the Bolsheviks.

Bailey shares the responsibility for the outrages suffered at the hands of the British by the Soviet mission which was dispatched from Tashkent to Iran in September 1918 with Y. Babushkin at the head. Two of its members, N. N. Afanasyev and A. Baratov related how Bailey, who had managed to worm his way into the mission's confidence in Tashkent, persuaded it to take the road that led through Meshed where its members were arrested by the British.³ British officers subjected them to humiliation and beat them with canes. On nine occasions the mission's members were taken to be shot and each time the British offered to spare their lives if they renounced "their Lenin". One member of the mission, Kalashnikov, was killed. The gaolers repeated that if the mission had arrived a fortnight earlier its members would have definitely been executed together with Shaumyan, that is, together with the 26 Baku commissars. Subsequently as we have said earlier, they were held as hostages in case Bailey and Tredwell were arrested.

Almost thirty years later, Bailey attributed the failure of his mission and the final victory of Soviet power in Turkestan to chance rather than to the people's firm determination to uphold their Soviet power in the fight against the combined forces of internal and external counter-revolution. Bailey wrote in this connection that if all these forces (Malleson, the *basmachi*, underground counter-revolution—*R.T.*) had "moved at the same time, say in conjunction with Kol-

¹ *Ibid.*, No. 10, p. 7.

² *Ibid.*, No. 9, p. 13.

³ *Ibid.*, No. 9, p. 14.

chak's final advance on Tula (south of Moscow), there is in my mind no doubt that Bolshevism would have been crushed in Turkestan".¹

In October 1918, he witnessed the rout of the Turkestan Military Organisation; in January 1919, he witnessed the rout and the flight of Osipov's bands and at the end of summer of 1919, he came to realise that even the British forces in Transcaspia could not put an end to Soviet power in Turkestan.²

Failing to achieve his objectives Bailey fled to Bukhara after managing to stay over a year in Tashkent with the help of the traitors Mandich and Gelashvili and counter-revolutionary elements. Regaining his spirits in the Emirate of Bukhara he wrote in October 1919 to the British command in Meshed requesting permission to remain in Bukhara for the time being. But he was forced to flee Bukhara, too.

By April 1919, the British troops had pulled out of Transcaspia leaving only a part of their forces in Krasnovodsk. Their withdrawal from Transcaspia, however, was not due to the cessation of hostilities against Germany and Turkey or to the expiration of the agreement between the British and the Socialist-Revolutionaries signed on August 19, 1918, as some writers assert for the obvious reason of whitewashing the interventionists.

Actually, the British intended to expand their intervention following the armistice at Compiègne. Colonel Tod wrote that early in 1919 "a plan was in contemplation for giving further support to the Russians in their struggle against Bolshevism", and that it was hoped to "clear the Bolsheviks out of Turkestan" by the spring of that year.³ A decision was taken to reinforce the British troops in Transcaspia and as a preliminary step in this direction Brigadier-General G. A. Beatty, who was well acquainted with the local situation, was attached to Major-General Malleeson's headquar-

¹ F. M. Bailey, *Mission to Tashkent*, p. 51.

² *Ibid.*, p. 192.

³ J. K. Tod, "Operations in Transcaspia", *The Army Quarterly*, London, July 1928, No. 2, p. 296.

ters. In January 1919, he was put in command of the British troops in the area.¹

Britain attached great importance to the operations of her troops in Transcaspia. This is proved by the fact that in January 1919 the British turned over the command of this front from headquarters in Simla to the War Ministry and George Milne, who was in charge of the British naval forces in the Black Sea, was made Commander-in-Chief. On January 21, 1919, he made an inspection trip to Bairam-Ali. These measures of the British command were directly connected with the completion of preparations of the Entente's first campaign against Soviet Russia undertaken in the spring of 1919. Britain persisted in her efforts to gain firm control of Central Asia, particularly of Transcaspia.

By sending troops into Transcaspia and Bailey's military espionage mission to Tashkent, Britain intended to put a quick end to Soviet power in Turkestan with the help of internal counter-revolutionary forces, particularly bourgeois-nationalist and Pan-Islamic elements, who were seeking foreign support, and who, the British hoped, would be able to win over broad sections of the local population. But nothing came of these plans. Created and supported by the people, Soviet power proved to be stronger than the British imperialists had bargained for. Their military and financial support to clandestine anti-Soviet organisations, local bourgeois nationalists and feudal lords invigorated the activity of internal counter-revolutionary forces, but their hopes of seeing the broad masses of working people coming to the support of the internal reactionary forces were not destined to materialise. Rising to the defence of Soviet power and their national liberation and social emancipation, all sections of the working people of Central Asia, some earlier, others later, supported by the other peoples of Russia, inflicted a shattering blow on the internal counter-revolutionary forces and the British interventionists. Lacking in weapons but not in spirit, Red Army units comprising people of all the local nationalities and Russians proved to be extremely battleworthy, contrary to the aggressors' expectations and not only held their ground

¹ *Ibid.*

against the well-armed British and whiteguard units but put them to rout. The British sustained heavy casualties which were at times as high as 50 per cent of the ranks engaged.¹ The local population also offered increasing resistance to the British.

The powerful onslaught of the young Red Army made the position of the interventionists in Transcaspia even more shaky. The British ruling circles had to decide whether to evacuate their troops or to extend the scope of military operations on the vast territory of Central Asia by moving a huge number of troops through the neighbouring countries which were in the midst of a revolutionary struggle against British domination. At the same time Britain's allies, particularly the USA, which together with her were preparing a campaign against Soviet Russia, were not at all anxious to see her gain territories in Central Asia without their having a hand. The United States intended to play a most energetic part in the partitioning of the territory of the former tsarist empire. US President Woodrow Wilson devised one plan after another for enslaving the peoples of Central Asia and the Transcaucasus. As regards Central Asia, he thought that "it may well be that some power will have to be given a limited mandate to act as protector."²

Such was the "concern" for the future of the Central Asian peoples displayed by the imperialist circles of the very states whose propagandists are now slandering the solution of the national question by Soviet power and purporting that the Western powers had acted in the interests of the freedom of peoples, while Soviet power had in practice "deprived" them of the right to self-determination.

Though the British forces had been evacuated from Transcaspia the British ruling circles did not give up their aggressive plans with regard to Central Asia nor their intentions to deprive the peoples there of the right to self-determination which the October Revolution had granted them.

¹ J. K. Tod, "Operations in Transcaspia", *The Army Quarterly*, London, July 1928, No. 2, p. 293.

² Edward House, *The Intimate Papers of Colonel House*, Vol. IV, London, 1928, p. 204.

The ruling circles in Britain and other Western powers knew very well that the success of their plans depended on the rout of the main forces of the Revolution in Central Russia which was the reliable bulwark of all the revolutionary masses of the national borderlands of the former tsarist empire. The dedicated armed struggle of Russia's working class and peasantry which resulted in the defeat of the combined counter-revolutionary and imperialist forces in Russia saved the peoples of the Transcaucasus and Central Asia from bourgeois-landowner oppression and foreign domination.

Britain's invasion of Soviet territory took a heavy toll in lives. Military operations seriously damaged the national economy; many enterprises were wrecked or put out of operation. Oil production in the Caucasus and cotton production in Turkestan sharply declined. The intervention and military operations conducted in the south of Russia by the white-guard armies which had been outfitted by the Western powers deprived Russia's industry of these raw materials. Taking into account also the expenditures on the maintenance of the army, the very general estimates made at the time showed that the damage inflicted on the economy of the Soviet state, excluding its functional dislocation, amounted to 1,250 million rubles or 3,300 million francs.¹

The historically doomed imperialism wanted to augment its possessions at the expense of Central Asia which, in the opinion of the imperialists, was left without a master after the October Revolution. But the people, the real masters, managed to protect their national and social freedom. Moreover, they set an example to the population of the colonies of the imperialist powers.

Lenin wrote: "A nation in which the majority of the workers and peasants realise, feel and see that they are fighting for their own Soviet power, for the rule of the working people, for the cause whose victory will ensure them and their children all the benefits of culture, of all that has been created by human labour—such a nation can never be vanquished."²

¹ *Who Is the Debtor?*, p. 354.

² V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 29, p. 319.

In connection with the conjectures of the modern scribes concerning the self-determination of the Central Asian peoples we should like to quote the following: "The peoples of Central Asia are living today better than they had lived before. . . . The national individuality of the Turkic people has been recognised by the Soviet Government. . . . The languages of the local population . . . are recognised as official, its representatives hold administrative posts. . . . All this testifies to the changes that have been taking place since the Revolution".¹

The results of self-determination of the Central Asian peoples are even more striking if we look at them today, from the height of the more than 50 years that have elapsed since the Socialist Revolution of 1917.

8. THE PROGRAMME FOR OVERCOMING BACKWARDNESS

Tsarism left Central Asia a backward borderland with a typically colonial economy. When Soviet power was established it also had to contend with the serious difficulties caused by the national-psychological barrier which had its roots in the age-old national mode of life, customs, handicraft industries, religion and the petty-bourgeois peasant character of the majority of the population. In addition to these objective factors it encountered the opposition of the deposed feudal lords, the clergy, *bais*, and the compradore and industrial bourgeoisie who strove to continue exploiting the people. Taking advantage of certain errors committed by representatives of young Soviet power, they tried to foment nationalistic and religious sentiments among the ignorant and downtrodden masses and to incite them against the Russians and "their Soviets".

Then there were difficulties engendered by the First World War and the Civil War, the fight against the *basmachi* and the foreign intervention. In view of all these adverse circumstances Soviet power could not promptly improve the position of the Central Asian people, particularly their economic and cultural status.

The fifth edition of a Soviet geography textbook published in 1927 described the life of the Turkestan peoples, in the following words:

"Turkmen are the purest representatives of the Turkic tribe. Most of them are semi-nomads. . . . The majority of

¹ J. Castagné, *Les Basmachis*, Paris, 1925, p. 74.

the Uzbeks lead a settled life and many of them are expert canal builders. The Kirghizes roam mainly in the northeastern part of Turkestan. . . . The Tajiks lead a settled life, their main occupation being farming and horticulture.

"The Uzbeks live in single-storeyed, flat-roofed mud houses often without windows: light comes in through the door which opens into a courtyard. The furniture is very simple usually consisting of a low table and sleeping mats.

"Uzbek cities also consist of single-storeyed mud houses with flat roofs surrounded by gardens; the streets are narrow. Life in the city is wholly centered on the bazaar with its invariably crowded tea-shops.

"The squares and trading streets are lined with open stalls displaying various goods such as clothes, footwear and furniture, most of which are often made on the spot. The streets are filled with the clamour of craftsmen, the tapping of tools, shouts of traders selling their wares, the roar of camels and the braying of asses and the squeaking of carts.

"In Turkestan ploughs are usually drawn by oxen or camels. . . .

"The manufacturing industry is in its nascent stage and so far consists of ginneries and oil mills.

"Only primitive methods are used in processing raw materials. . . .

"Trade in Turkestan is confined to the exchange of agricultural products for manufactured goods. The principal items taken out of the area are cotton, wool, dried fruit, silk, etc., while cotton fabrics, ironware, sugar, timber, kerosene and other commodities are brought in.

"The most widespread forms of travel in Turkestan are by two-wheeled carts or astride horses, asses and camels."¹

This was written at a time when the Soviet state, exerting tremendous efforts to surmount the economic dislocation caused by the First World War and the Civil War was launching its first five-year plan, when the people of Turkestan continued to fight against internal counter-revolutionaries

¹ S. Sokolov and P. Uvarov, *Geography of the USSR According to Regions Fixed by Gosplan*, State Publishing House, Moscow-Leningrad, 1927, pp. 302-08, 309-11 (in Russian).

and the *basmachi* supported by Britain right up to the mid-1930s.

In March 1921, the Tenth Congress of the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks) considered the national question and decided to "help the toiling masses of the non-Russian peoples to catch up with Central Russia" by developing their Soviet national statehood, preparing and training their own personnel for the administrative, economic and juridical apparatus and promoting culture and education.

Especially important was the decision to abolish the "actual national inequality" which rested on "historically formed economic inequality".¹

The Congress resolution noted that the abolition of such inequality was "a prolonged process requiring a determined and persistent struggle against all survivals of national oppression and colonial slavery".²

Emphatically condemning both the great-power and local bourgeois-nationalistic deviations "as harmful and dangerous for the communist cause", the Congress found it necessary to "note the particular danger and harm of the first deviation—a deviation towards great-power tendencies and colonisation".³

Such an approach to the question became possible only thanks to the socialist revolution led by the working class and its vanguard, the Communist Party. The development of the peoples who had attained self-determination on the basis of this revolution proceeded along a road formerly unknown to history.

The Twelfth Party Congress held in April 1923 again considered the national question this time from the practical point of view. It characterised three aspects of the dire heritage of tsarism in the national question: (1) survivals of great-power chauvinism, (2) actual, that is economic and cultural inequality of the nationalities of the USSR and (3) survivals of nationalism, which in some cases developed into

¹ CPSU in *Resolutions of Congresses, Conferences, and Plenary Meetings of the Central Committee*, Part I, Ed. 7, Moscow, 1953, p. 559 (in Russian).

² Ibid.

³ Ibid., p. 562.

local chauvinism (as an example the Congress resolution indicated the Uzbek chauvinism in Bukhara and Khorezm against the Turkmen and Kirghizes).¹

The Congress recommended the following practical steps: (1) to ensure the equality of rights and duties of the republics in the central bodies of the Union; (2) to establish within the system of the higher bodies of the Union a special agency which would represent all national republics and regions without exception on an equal footing; (3) to ensure the actual participation of representatives of the republics in the executive bodies of the Union and the satisfaction of the needs and requirements of the peoples of the Union; (4) to grant the republics adequate financial, particularly budgetary rights, enabling their governments to come forward with their own state-administrative, cultural and economic initiative; (5) to build republican bodies primarily out of local inhabitants who know their peoples' language, mode of life, traits and customs; (6) to promulgate laws ensuring that the native languages of other nationalities living in a given area are spoken in all governmental bodies and institutions, laws which with all revolutionary severity would punish all those violating national rights, particularly the rights of the national minorities; (7) to intensify educational work in the Red Army to promote the ideas of fraternity and solidarity of the peoples of the Union and to take all the necessary measures to ensure the full defensive capability of the republics.²

Lenin devoted tremendous attention to the correct implementation of the Party's programme on the national question, decisively cutting short all attempts to curtail the equality of nations whether in the economic, political or cultural spheres.

The self-determination of the peoples of the colonial borderlands of former tsarist Russia on the basis of socialist revolution—the highest form of self-determination—was ensured by the victory of the proletarian revolution. Concerned with speeding up the development of the material and cultural forces of the peoples of these regions so as to bring them up as quickly as possible to the level of the population of the

¹ *GPSU in Resolutions...*, Part I, Ed. 7, pp. 713-15 (in Russian).

² *Ibid.*, pp. 716-17 (in Russian).

advanced parts of the country, Lenin pointed out on December 31, 1922 that "internationalism on the part of oppressors or 'great' nations, as they are called (though they are great only in their violence, only great as bullies) must consist not only in the observance of the formal equality of nations but even in an inequality of the oppressor nation, the great nation, that must make up for the inequality which obtains in actual practice. Anybody who does not understand this has not grasped the real proletarian attitude to the national question, he is still essentially petty bourgeois in his point of view. . . . In one way or another, by one's attitude or by concessions, it is necessary to compensate the non-Russians for the lack of trust, for the suspicion and the insults to which the government of the 'dominant' nation subjected them in the past."¹

This was a temporary but essential measure aimed at overcoming the material and psychological barrier, and also the obstacles engendered by formal equality which gave equality in rights under unequal conditions and opportunities.

It was genuine emancipation of the former colonial peoples. How feeble against this background are the declarations of British, French, Belgian, Dutch and US colonialists about their "enlightening", "decolonising" missions. Having plundered the colonies and enriched themselves at the expense of the oppressed peoples, they do not give as much as a thought to the latter's actual liberation and simply do not want to help the peoples of the former colonies to break out of the meshes of economic backwardness.

The rapid development of the Central Asian peoples, whose achievements amaze the world and are recognised even by the calumniators, took place with the all-round assistance and support of the Union Government, of the other peoples of the USSR and, above all, with the support and assistance of the Russian people. This formed the basis for a two-in-one process of the formation and the bourgeoning of the socialist nations and their drawing together and consolidation in a single family of the fraternal peoples of the USSR. Their drawing together which began during the struggle for socio-

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 36, p. 608.

political self-determination in the first years following the October Revolution, intensified the ensuing cultural and economic development.

In these years the economically more advanced peoples of the USSR, and first and foremost the Russian nation, rendered the Central Asian peoples tremendous help in attaining these objectives, and, primarily, in eliminating actual inequality. In May 1918, Lenin signed the Decree On the Allocation of 50 Million Rubles on Irrigation Work in Turkestan and on the Organisation of This Work. The same year several trainloads of grain were delivered to Turkestan, and in 1920, Russia sent equipment for a number of textile and other factories. This assistance grew year after year.

From 1925 to 1929, the Tajik Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic was granted credits to the sum of 480,000 rubles. In 1924 and 1925, it received 71,287 rubles to repair the irrigation system damaged by the *basmachi*, and in 1925 and 1926, seven times as much (504,000 rubles). In 1925, in view of the drought and crop failure, the republic received a million rubles in aid. In the period from 1925 to 1927, Eastern Bukhara was exempt from agricultural tax, while in the Pamirs it was not levied until 1929, etc.

At first the budgets of the republics largely depended on subsidies from the Union Government. For example, in some years of the First Five-Year Plan period these subsidies accounted for more than 70 per cent of the budget of the Turkmenian Soviet Socialist Republic. In that period subsidies made up 75 per cent of the budget of the Tajik Republic.¹

Soviet Central Asia is part of the Soviet Socialist Federation which includes four sovereign socialist states, two of which, the Uzbek and Tajik republics, have one autonomy each—the Kara-Kalpak ASSR and the Gorno-Badakhshan Autonomous Region.

Specialists in international law abroad, including those in the imperialist states, recognise the rights of the Union Republics of the USSR in international law. Among these

¹ N. I. Matyushkin, *Solution of the National Question in the USSR*, p. 9 (in Russian).

specialists are US Professor Vernon Aspaturian and Leonard Schapiro.¹

The magazine *Africa and the World* (October 1967) described the USSR as a socialist community of 15 republics, each with its own flag, language, government with extensive powers in internal matters, a government which co-operates with the governments of the other republics in matters of mutual interests, namely in foreign affairs, defence and economic planning.

It is, however, more important to deal with another issue raised by the "defenders" of the national independence of the Central Asian peoples. It is the sovereignty of a nation.

The sovereignty of a nation and its right to self-determination, which is an expression of this sovereignty, can be restricted only by the free will of a given nation itself and this, in turn, is an embodiment of its sovereignty. In equal measure this applies to any of the elements making up the content of the right to self-determination.

Touching upon the constitutional right to self-determination in the USSR bourgeois writers always emphasise that not all nations and nationalities of the Soviet Union have the right to secede, but only nations which have their Union Republics (Article 17 of the Constitution).

First, it should be said that not a single state in the capitalist world can claim that it has ever demonstrated its official recognition of this right by allowing any one of its parts to secede. It was not accidental that this right was so sharply opposed by the imperialist powers and a number of other countries at the 1968 and 1970 sessions of the UN Special Committee on Principles of International Law Concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States.

Second, since the Union as a federation was established by the Treaty of 1922 it is natural that the right to secede from it belongs to those who signed it, to the Union Republics.

¹ V. Aspaturian, *The Union Republics in Soviet Diplomacy*, Geneva, 1960, pp. 15-30; L. Schapiro, *The Government and Politics of the Soviet Union*, 1965, p. 145.

Third, any subject of the right to self-determination has, in particular, the right to establish an independent state. The USSR is not an exception. In this respect the example of Central Asia is sufficiently convincing. In Central Asia where there was not a single national, or, generally speaking, sovereign state (there were two feudal protectorates and one colony of Russia), four national sovereign states appeared as a result of revolutionary self-determination, in the course of which they passed through the phases of autonomous statehood. Today they embrace all the basic forms of national statehood of the peoples of the USSR: autonomous national region, autonomous Soviet socialist republic and Union Soviet socialist republic.

National sovereignty and the right to self-determination, however, do not stand only for the right to establish independent states, and secession has never been and could not have been an aim in itself. The sole objective of the right to secede, as an aspect of the right to self-determination, is the defence and consolidation of national sovereignty. Otherwise it is not only meaningless, but even reactionary, all the more so when in the name of a given people demands for secession or propaganda of secession come from renegades or persons notorious for their servility to imperialism.

In conditions of genuine self-determination on a socialist basis, when the determining factor for each nation and nationality are its achievements in communist construction, its ever-increasing social homogeneity, its ties of monolithic moral, political and socio-economic unity and fraternity with all other peoples of the Soviet Union, in conditions when each nation and nationality has become an inalienable part of a new entity—the Soviet People—the implementation of the right to self-determination in the form of secession from the USSR, as the people with an anti-Soviet outlook would have liked it to happen, would undoubtedly result in the seceding nation losing everything it has achieved. Therefore, the appeals for secession or playing secession up as an element of self-determination are reactionary when applied to the USSR.

“Balkanisation” has already been condemned as a reactionary process during the decolonisation of Africa. This has

been recorded in the decisions of all the three conferences of independent African states.¹

Still more reactionary are the summons for the “balkanisation” of the multinational Soviet Union which owes its greatness and power to its community of fraternal nations and nationalities.

It is not the secession from the federation or the formation of an independent state *per se* that exemplifies the fullness of national sovereignty, but the degree to which the freedom to express one's will is exercised and the extent to which its results are ensured. The formation of independent states has been an essential feature of decolonisation, but, judging by the experience of the young states, it could not possibly have been an aim in itself. The second phase of self-determination has now set in in the Third World. The state is now being used as a means of ensuring the fullness of the national sovereignty of the people.

The Soviet socialist society has already passed this stage. Socialism has laid the basis and created the opportunities for ensuring national sovereignty for any of the more than 100 nations and nationalities of the Soviet Union, where the purpose of the national state and national statehood differs from that in the capitalist world. Generally speaking, this purpose is to ensure the all-round development of a given people with account being taken of its national features, within the framework and for the benefit of the planned building of communism which is the common task of all Soviet peoples. These two elements cannot contradict one another, for they are the components of the common road along which the multinational Soviet society is moving.

It would be wrong, however, to draw the conclusion that the right to self-determination is in some way restricted under socialism. As far back as November 1917, Lenin said: “We have nothing to fear, whatever the number of independent republics. The important thing for us is not where the state border runs, but whether or not the working people of all nations remain allied in their struggle against the

¹ *Independent Africa, Documents*, compiled by R. A. Tuzmuhamedov and V. L. Kukushkin, Moscow, 1965 (in Russian).

bourgeoisie, irrespective of nationality."¹ The provision for the secession of the component parts from the RSFSR was legally embodied in Article 49 (Para. E) of the 1918 Constitution of the RSFSR.

The right to self-determination from the standpoint of international law is uniform to all subjects concerned, wherever they may be situated. Just as indisputable is the requirement of international law that only the people themselves are entitled to decide their future, including the forms of state organisation, and only through the free expression of their will.

Under the 1936 Constitution of the USSR, the right to secede from the Union is granted to the Union Republics. The experience of state building in the multinational Soviet Union² shows that any juridical restrictions in the matter of the transition of autonomous republics to the status of Union Republics (border position, size of population, etc.) are unjustified if they curtail the right to self-determination and the sovereign will of a socialist nation.³

The level of economic development is usually the most essential indicator of a country's achievements.

What, in this respect, is characteristic of the self-determined Third World countries? Opening the Second United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) in March 1968, India's Prime Minister Mrs. Indira Gandhi said that the role of the imperialist states in the exploitation of dependent countries is known to all; they created no economic basis for the development of material and manpower resources and for independent growth.

The annual growth rate of the gross national income of the Third World countries has been declining since their

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 26, p. 344.

² In 1923, there were four Union Republics in the USSR, 13 autonomous republics, 16 autonomous regions; by 1967, there were 15 Union Republics, 20 autonomous republics, eight autonomous regions and ten national areas.

³ B. V. Shchetinin, "Some Theoretical Problems of National and State Organisation in the USSR in the Period of All-Out Communist Construction", *Pravovedeniye* (Jurisprudence), No. 2, 1965, pp. 43-44 (in Russian).

independence and is now, on the whole, below the minimum level (five per cent) fixed by the first conference in 1964. The per capita growth in these countries is also falling off. The growth of the per capita gross national product in the developing countries dropped from 2.2 per cent in the years 1955-60 to two per cent in 1966, while the corresponding figures for the advanced countries were 2 and 3.8 per cent.

The situation, as any impartial observer will see, is totally different in the Central Asian republics.

At this juncture we should like to mention a vital specific feature of the economic development of the Union Republics, a feature which falsifiers are stubbornly trying to interpret in a way that would suit their interests.

The treaty on the formation of the Soviet Union is based on the right of the uniting peoples to self-determination. Under socialism their will voluntarily expressed in this document also signified their recognition of the principle of democratic centralism embodied in the Constitution of the USSR.

A basically important aspect of this self-determination arising from concrete historical conditions has been the establishment of a single all-Union economy based on the rational socialist division of labour. The need for such an economy, as also the necessity for military and political unity, became clear to the people in the course of the first years following the October Socialist Revolution. At the time the bourgeoisie in the national borderlands was doing its utmost to establish state borders, between the local working people and the Russian workers (this applies not only to Central Asia, but to the Transcaucasus, the Ukraine and elsewhere) by playing up nationalism which was engendered by historical conditions and fomented by tsarism and the local exploiters. The bourgeoisie in the national border regions was backed by the overthrown Russian bourgeoisie and the British, French, US and German imperialists. The treachery of the national bourgeoisie accelerated the growth of the class-consciousness of the working people. The working people realised that they needed an international alliance to uphold their social and national freedom and speed up

their development so as to be able to meet all their requirements, and this determined the voluntary military, economic and political unification of the peoples in an international Union.

In these conditions it was in the interests of the united peoples to reject an autarchic approach to the national economy. The task of ensuring the speediest possible development of the economy of each people and the Union as a whole called for unconditional though flexible account and correct combination of specific and common interests in a single national economic plan. The principal difficulty was that Central Asia was economically backward compared with the Russia of those years. The economic development of the Union of the working people had to take place with the national borderlands making faster progress than the rest of the country. This necessitated a systematic, long-term centralised redistribution of the national income in favour of the border regions. The brunt of the burden was to be shouldered by those who produced a proportionately bigger share of the national income. This was proletarian internationalism in action. How is it possible to put the blame on those who used methods incompatible with bourgeois morals and commercialism to help the peoples of the former colonial outskirts to rise to their feet.

The need to contribute as much as possible to their own development and the law of socialist (not capitalist) division of labour predetermined the fact that parallel with the development of the multi-sectoral economy there remained and developed those sectors of the economy which appeared in the national outskirts during the colonial period. But now these sectors were operating to further the building of socialism and to meet the needs of the working people.

Assistance and mutual assistance have always been two aspects of proletarian internationalism. Deepening and developing they remain the characteristic features of socialist internationalism.

Such is this very important feature of the economic activity of the Soviet peoples. It is the objective beneficial factor of *socialist* development of the family of Soviet peoples, a factor which due to objective reasons, is beyond the reach

of the peoples embraced by the capitalist system of the economy.

Judging by the experience of solving the national question in Central Asia and by the development of the young states that emerged in the post-war period in place of the colonial empires, the rates and trends of economic development, in the final count, constitute one of the main criteria by which it is possible to appraise the genuineness of the self-determination of a people and the national liberation of a country.

9. A LEAP INTO SOCIALISM

"We are now exercising our main influence on the international revolution through our economic policy.... The struggle in this field has become global," Lenin wrote in his time.¹ This statement fully applies also to the process of national liberation in Central Asia. It is the Central Asian peoples' unprecedented progress in economic development—an essential factor in the solution of the national question—that is now influencing the minds of the leaders of the young states where the achievement of economic independence and the attainment of a rapid rise in the well-being of the population have become the most crucial problems.

The table below lists some general figures illustrating the development of the four Central Asian republics and indices for some Asian countries.

Industrialisation is the most important indicator of the economic growth of all countries. In 1967, the US magazine *Business Week* carried an article on the 50th anniversary of the establishment of Soviet power which contained the following observation: "In the 50 years since the Bolshevik revolution, the Soviet Union has climbed from fifth to second among the world's industrial powers...."

"The speed with which Russia achieved industrialisation is probably the Soviet system's most impressive accomplishment—without it, it's doubtful whether the Communist regime could have survived."²

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 32, p. 437.

² *Business Week*, 1967, April 29, p. 82.

A LEAP INTO SOCIALISM

141

Central Asian republics			India	Iran	Pakistan	Turkey
	1928	1965	1964			
Per capita output of electricity, kwh	4	950	73	58	34	143
Per capita output of steel, 1 kg	0	21	13	0*	0	13
Per capita output of coal, 1 kg	49	513	128	7	12	237
Per capita production of oil, 1 kg	7	665	5	3,700	5	28
Per capita output of cement, 1 kg	16	239	20	33	15	94
Per capita production of cotton fabrics, m	0.5	20	10	0	7	18
Number of tractors (in terms of 15 hp units) per 1,000 hectares of sown land	0.2	34.7	0.23	0.73	0.18	2.68
Percentage of literate over 9 years of age	16	87	24	15	16	30
Pupils in general education schools per 10,000 of population	460	2,325	1,031	886	698	1,241
Number of students per 10,000 of population	7	140	24	11	16	24
Daily circulation of newspapers per 10,000 of population	22	223	13	15	5	45
Number of doctors per 10,000 of population	4	17.4	1.9	3.4	0.9	4.0
Number of hospital beds per 10,000 of population	15	91	—	—	2.8	16.3
Death-rate per 1,000 of population	—	6.1	8.6	8.7	16.5	—

* The first Iranian iron and steel works is being built in Isphahan with Soviet assistance.

Source: *We and the Planet*, Facts and Figures, Moscow, 1967, pp. 32-33 (in Russian).

From the industrial areas of Soviet Russia industrialisation spread into the Union Republics including the republics of Central Asia.

Let us take Uzbekistan. Prior to the October Revolution

all it had was a handful of enterprises engaged in the primary processing of local raw materials—ginneries, cotton-pressing shops and oil mills—and coal-mines. A few decades later it already had a powerful industry embracing more than a hundred branches, including chemical, metallurgical, metal-working engineering and machine-tool building industries, and is now turning out a great variety of products.

Producing more than two-thirds of the national output of cotton, Uzbekistan is its principal supplier in the USSR. In 1970, the Uzbek Republic produced 4,500,000 tons of this valuable raw material, or nine times as much as prior to the Revolution. Karakul sheep-breeding, sericulture, cultivation of rice and kenaf, horticulture and viticulture in the republic are of major importance for the entire country. The republic produces more than 33 per cent of karakul skins, over 50 per cent of the silk cocoons and over 90 per cent of kenaf fibre obtained in the Soviet Union.¹ The production of gas, of which there are inexhaustible resources in the Kyzyl-Kum desert, is mounting rapidly and today Uzbekistan accounts for a sixth of the national gas output. In recent years the republic has also become a major supplier of gold.

The socialist development of Uzbekistan and of the other Central Asian republics is not only characterised by the fact that their agriculture and extractive industries have risen to unprecedented heights in a short period of time. Uzbekistan today is an important centre of the Soviet engineering, chemical and other modern industries. It manufactures farm machinery, diesel engines, pumps, excavators and other items, and exports its products to 91 countries. For the volume of industrial output, Uzbekistan now occupies fifth place in the USSR although prior to 1917 it played absolutely no role in this sphere.

In 1970, the Soviet people fulfilled their eighth five-year economic development plan in the course of which industrial production rose by almost a third in Uzbekistan and 40 major industrial enterprises were built there. The share of the engineering, non-ferrous metallurgy, chemical and other branches

¹ *The USSR and Foreign Countries after the October Socialist Revolution*, Statistical Review, Moscow, 1970, p. 271 (in Russian).

of the heavy industry in the total volume of industrial production increased appreciably in this period.

Equipped with modern machines, the republic's building organisations have acquired enormous experience in constructing large industrial complexes at a fast rate. For example, the Almalyk Chemical Plant, a modern industrial giant, was built in a record time of one year.

The sustained high rates and the vast scope of economic development in the Central Asian republics are unique. Their rates of development have always been higher than those in the Soviet Union as a whole so as to ensure their rapid development within the framework of the all-Union division of labour.

The following figures illustrate this fact. In the period from 1950 (100 per cent) to 1968 the average annual growth rates of world industrial production were 7.1 per cent: 5.3 per cent in the advanced capitalist states, 7.9 per cent in the developing countries, 10.4 per cent in the USSR and 10.7 in all the socialist countries taken together.¹ The rates of growth of the Central Asian republics were still higher: while in 1966 the overall volume of industrial production in the USSR was 498 per cent² as compared with 1950, the corresponding figure for Kirghizia, for example, was 552 per cent.³

The table below shows the dynamics of industrial production in the Central Asian republics for a period of 25 years beginning with 1940 (1940=100 per cent):

	1950	1960	1965
USSR	173	524	791
Uzbek SSR	183	420	630
Kirghiz SSR	215	620	1,036
Turkmenian SSR	143	336	451
Tajik SSR	151	430	664

Source: *We and the Planet*, p. 92 (in Russian).

¹ *The USSR and Foreign Countries...*, p. 63 (in Russian).

² *The Land of Soviets in 50 Years*, Collection of Statistics, Moscow, 1967, p. 105 (in Russian).

³ *Kirghizstan in 50 Years of Soviet Power*, Collection of Statistics, Frunze, 1967, p. 41 (in Russian).

Through centralised redistribution these republics have always received a proportionately larger share of the funds into their budgets. All this has been the result of the planned development within the framework of an integral inter-connected complex—the national economy of the USSR.

Remaining for a long time recipients of assistance to ensure their accelerated development, the Central Asian peoples are now actively participating in the development of the USSR economy as a whole.

The growth of urbanisation has been another factor characteristic of the industrial development of the Central Asian republics. The following figures (for 1913 and 1966) show how this process developed: Uzbekistan—in 1913 per one urban dweller there were three rural dwellers (1,060,000 and 3,306,000) and in 1965 this ratio had changed to 1:2 (3,864,000 and 7,032,000); Kirghizia—1:7 (106,000 and 753,000) and 1:1.5 (1,060,000 and 1,689,000); Tajikistan 1:10 (95,000 and 939,000) and 1:2 (970,000 and 1,684,000); Turkmenia—1:8 (117,000 and 925,000) and 1:1 (970,000 and 996,000).¹

The modern urbanisation in Central Asia is a direct outcome of its swift industrial development.

Here is an example. In the past 15-20 years ten cities arose on the slopes of the Kurama Mountains rising south of the Uzbek capital Tashkent.

Just imagine ten cities in what was once a deserted canyon. "Kurama is my native land," says the excavator operator, Hero of Socialist Labour Rahim Kadyrov. "My father, grandfather and great-grandfather were born here. Its history is as old as the land itself. Those mounds below are the ruins of ancient fortresses, 12 of them. People here were all handicraftsmen.

"And where our Almalyk now stands, once towered an unassailable fortress."

Rahim Kadyrov is one of those who reached into the depths of Copper Mountain. The first blast he set off forced Kurama to disclose its treasures and then other mountains—Kalma-

¹ Calculated on the basis of figures given in *The Land of Soviets in 50 years*, pp. 314-34 (in Russian).

kyr, Altyntapkan and Kurgashinkan—opened their coffers. Not only copper but a real treasurestore of minerals—gold, silver, molybdenum, lead, zinc, manganese, fluorite, crystal, marble—was found in Kurama. And a giant complex was built on the Kurama Pass to process the polymetallic ores.

Neither Genghis Khan, nor Alexander the Great, nor the Kipchak and the Cuman people were able to conquer Kurama, says drilling machine operator Kasym Saparov, Rahim Kadyrov's friend. It opened the doors to its treasures to the Soviet people. Apart from non-ferrous metal ores the banks of the Angren and its tributaries abound in huge deposits of sand, pebbles and gravel. So we built another enterprise in Ahangaran near Almalyk for the production of cement and slate. A building materials and plastics factory is under construction there. Just recently refractory clay and kaolin were discovered in the area. Probably their reserves will prove to be the biggest in the country and then a ceramics factory will be built in the Kurama Mountains.

Central Asia's largest chemical fertilizer plant, whose construction was started at the end of 1968, has now been completed.

At the foot of the mountains, as though shouldering them aside lies Angren, Uzbekistan's principal colliery.

... Descending to the northwest down tiers of mountain ridges you find yourself in the corridor of "evil winds". There stands Bekabad, a town with 16 industrial enterprises, the most important of which are an iron and steel works, where whole dynasties of famed workers are employed, and the Farkhad Hydroelectric Power Station.

Returning from Bekabad you can pass through Yangiabad, a new geological centre, and going on to Tashkent you will go through Yangiyul and then through Chirchik, the chemical centre. This town was built in the years of the first five-Year plans and named after the river on which it stands. There is also the young town of Gazalkent which has a huge fruit canning factory whose products are delivered to all parts of the country.

Another town, Pskent, the youngest of the group, has just been built in the middle reaches of the Chirchik. It has a large park of earth-moving and other equipment. Lorries,

bulldozers, excavators and cranes from Pskent work in all parts of the Tashkent oasis.

There is a chain of cities on the majestic slopes of the Kurama Mountains. And the biggest one is Tashkent, a huge city, with a population consisting of people of more than 100 nationalities.

Against the background of the general economic upsurge of the Central Asian republics urbanisation is indirectly indicative of the modernisation and progress taking place in agriculture. On the whole, this progress is very significant. Today agriculture is a highly mechanised branch of the economy having made great progress in its development in a mere four decades.

A glance at the table will show this.

	Gross output (000 mln rubles)		Tractors (thous. in terms of 15 hp units)	
	1958	1965	1958	1965
USSR	48.5	56.0	932	3,200
Uzbekistan	1.7	2.2	35	127
Kirghizia	0.4	0.6	7	30
Tajikistan	0.3	0.5	5	24
Turkmenia	0.3	0.4	5	23

Source: *We and the Planet*, p. 93.

The cultural level of the Central Asian village has risen immeasurably. It is here that the cultural revolution has wrought the greatest changes. A striking illustration of these changes is the Tajik village of Pulatan in the north of Tajikistan near the town of Konibadam standing amidst pistachio and apricot orchards. Since the establishment of Soviet power this village has produced 30 scientists in various branches of knowledge, Professor Saabanisso Hakimova, Doctor of Medical Sciences, among them. Her sister Umrihova is Candidate of Medical Sciences, her brother Uktamdjon is Candidate of Geological and Mineralogical Sciences and her son has completed a post-graduate course at Moscow University.

Since culture and education are convincing indicators of the level of a nation's development, let us take a look at what self-determination gave the peoples of Turkestan in this field.

Furkat (Zakirjan Halmuhammed), a Central Asian poet who acquired his wisdom and glory through suffering and roaming from city to city not only in Central Asia, but also in Russia, Turkey, Arabia, India, Greece, Bulgaria and other countries, wrote:

*"Oh youths! The chronicles of yore
Pale before Russia's priceless lore.
May they enrich our sons and daughters,
The fruits of science Russia brought us!"*¹

This great erudite was the author of the philosophical aphorism "Knowledge is a gardener, its orchard is our land,"² which he included in his poem *Gymnasium*.

And indeed, Central Asia, once a great centre of advanced knowledge, had fallen behind in the period of modern history. In those years it had not produced a single scientist as great as Ibn-Sina (Avicenna), Biruni, Al Horezmi, Ulugbek and Navoi.

Science did not develop in colonial Central Asia. It was in the grip of obscurantism through which local free-thinkers, and democrats persistently, like young bamboo shoots, tried to force their way.

The situation was grim and the prospects gloomy.

On the basis of estimates made at the beginning of the century the conclusion was drawn that it would take 4,600 years (!) to wipe out illiteracy in Tashkent.

A mere 55 years later the UNO issued a document entitled "Planning for Balanced Social and Economic Development in the Uzbek Soviet Socialist Republic". Prepared by a group of experts who had visited the republic which said in part: "The level of achievement in education and health in the years since Uzbekistan was established in 1924... is striking, particularly when comparisons are made

¹ *Songs of the Centuries*, Vol. II, p. 487 (in Russian).

² *Ibid.*, p. 490.

with neighbouring Asian countries with somewhat similar basic resources and problems."¹

In Uzbekistan, where prior to the Revolution higher secular education was within reach of a handful of people, there are now more students per 10,000 of the population than in any European capitalist state or in the USA. They attend over 40 institutions of higher learning and secondary specialised schools, and, moreover, they can if they wish enroll at any institution of higher learning in any part of the Soviet Union. Today Uzbek institutions of higher learning have 80 per cent more students than there were in all universities and colleges of pre-revolutionary Russia in 1914.² According to UN figures in the 1958/59 academic year ten times as many children went to school as in 1927/28 (140,100 and 1,325,600).³ Ten years later there were 21 times as many (2,983,000).⁴ By 1960, there were 13 people with a higher education per 1,000 of the population in the republic.⁵

Here are a few figures showing the number of students in the Central Asian republics (thousands):

Republic	General educational schools		Specialised secondary educational institutions		Institutions of higher learning	
	1913	1968	1913	1968	1913	1968
Uzbek	18	2,983	0.1	148.4	—	224.1
Kirghiz	7	723	—	39.3	—	43.9
Tajik	0.4	699	—	32.7	—	40.9
Turkmenian	7	511	—	27.7	—	27.3

Source: *USSR and Foreign Countries...*, pp. 270-71 (in Russian).

While in the pre-revolutionary period there was not a single higher educational institution in Central Asia, in the

¹ United Nations E/CN. 5/346/Add. 5/Rev. 1, November 10, 1961, pp. 6-7.

² *The USSR and Foreign Countries...*, p. 271 (in Russian).

³ UN, op. cit., p. 127.

⁴ *The USSR and Foreign Countries...*, p. 270 (in Russian).

⁵ UN, op. cit., p. 7.

1966/67 academic year there were 55 with a student body of 283,000.¹ In 1967, there were 173 students per 10,000 of the population in Uzbekistan, 133 in Kirghizia, 131 in Tajikistan and 115 in Turkmenia. Corresponding figures for the advanced capitalist countries were 208 in the USA, 58 in the United Kingdom, 71 in France, 45 in the Federal Republic of Germany and 84 in Japan. The figures for the developing Asian countries were 28 in Turkey, 24 in India, 22 in Pakistan and 10 in Iran.²

Today the Central Asian republics have one of the highest educational levels in the USSR, although not long ago it was the lowest.

The level of education in the Union Republics changed as follows in the period from 1939 to 1970³:

	Number of persons with higher or secondary (complete or incomplete) education per 1,000 of the population over 10 years of age			Number of persons with higher or secondary (complete or incomplete) education per 1,000 of the employed		
	1939	1959	1970	1939	1959	1970
USSR	108	361	483	123	433	653
RSFSR	109	361	489	124	440	656
Ukrainian SSR	120	373	494	139	438	668
Byelorussian SSR	92	304	440	113	331	594
Uzbek SSR	55	352	456	61	447	661
Kazakh SSR	83	348	470	99	447	655
Georgian SSR	165	448	554	163	492	711
Azerbaijan SSR	113	400	471	122	473	674
Lithuanian SSR	81	232	382	no data	250	496
Moldavian SSR	57	264	397	no data	280	508
Latvian SSR	176	431	517	no data	502	661
Kirghiz SSR	46	342	452	56	429	643
Tajik SSR	40	325	420	45	407	602
Armenian SSR	128	445	516	135	527	697
Turkmenian SSR	65	387	475	78	497	682
Estonian SSR	161	386	506	no data	448	660

¹ *The Land of Soviets in 50 Years*, p. 276 (in Russian).

² *Ibid.*, pp. 278-79.

³ *Pravda*, April 17, 1971.

In line with the national programme of the CPSU and the instructions of the Tenth and Twelfth Party Congresses national personnel has been trained in Central Asia on an ever increasing planned scale, at rates that are higher than the average for the Soviet Union as a whole. While in the nine years ending 1966 the number of specialists with a higher or secondary specialised education engaged in the national economy increased almost two times in the Soviet Union (from 6,821,600 in 1957 to 12,923,700 in 1966), the number of Uzbek specialists rose more than 2.5 times (66,800 to 176,900), Kirghiz 2.3 times (14,100 and 32,300), Tajik 2.2 times (17,500 and 38,400), Turkmen 2.4 times (14,600 and 33,500) and Kara-Kalpak over two times (3,100 and 6,400).

Of the total number of Soviet specialists with a higher education 89,000 are Uzbeks, 17,000 Kirghizes, 19,000 Tajiks and 17,000 Turkmen.¹

Characteristic of the rates at which national personnel are trained is the rate of growth in the number of young people of local nationalities studying in institutions of higher learning. Compared with the 1927/28 academic year the number of Uzbeks enrolled at the country's universities and colleges in 1966/67 increased 225 times and the number in technical schools 19 times, the number of Kirghizes increased 187 and 28 times, Tajiks 199 and 45 times and Turkmen 178 and 20 times respectively.²

In comparison the situation, for example, in the Republic of South Africa, this imperialist citadel of apartheid, is grim indeed. Here, most Africans can get a primary education only. Of the total number of African schoolchildren, 97 per cent are in the first form, and 20 per cent stop going to school after the first year. Only 25 per cent of the schoolchildren get a primary education, and a mere 0.07 per cent get a complete school education.

The few schools that are available for Africans are packed two or three times above permissible norms.

In 1967, there were 3,700 medical students in the Republic of South Africa; 3,137 were white, 131 coloured, 312 Asians

¹ *The Land of Soviets in 50 Years*, pp. 233-34 (in Russian).

² *Ibid.*, p. 280.

and 131 Africans. South African colleges and universities train one white doctor per 10,000 of the white population and one African doctor per 1,140,000 of the African population. Speaking in Capetown on March 29, 1968, Education Minister Jan de Klerk said that of the 89 doctors who graduated in 1967 only 11 were Africans.

There is also discrimination against African teachers and instructors. It is only after 15 years of service that an African teacher is entitled to receive the highest salary, 180 rands a month. This is lower than the lowest salary paid to a white teacher. In 1965, only 1.33 per cent of the African teachers had diplomas.

For many years medical colleges attracted the largest number of Central Asian students. It was a sign of the times. The greatest number of epidemics and diseases have always plagued countries with a hot climate. Lacking sanitary conditions and a ramified health protection system the population of pre-revolutionary Central Asia suffered terribly from dracunculosis, malaria, dysentery, pox, cholera, tuberculosis and other diseases.

It can be said that the inclination for medicine among the young Central Asians is a regional feature. This also applies to many tropical countries and to the countries of the Third World as a whole. The past history of their development and the age-old sufferings of the people from various diseases have created not only a formidable psychological but in a certain sense a material basis for this.

But the amazing break-through in health protection in Central Asia mentioned in the UN report became possible only as a result of the establishment of Soviet power.

Without listing all the achievements in this field we shall mention only the number of doctors in the Central Asian republics.

The number of doctors (of all specialities) per 10,000 of the population in 1913 and 1968: in Uzbekistan 0.3 and 18.1, in Kirghizia 0.2 and 19.5, in Tajikistan 0.2 and 15.4, in Turkmenia 0.7 and 21.1.¹ This tremendous increase was attained since the establishment of Soviet power. In that period the

¹ *The USSR and Foreign Countries...*, pp. 270, 293, 297, 303.

Central Asian republics had caught up with or even overtaken advanced capitalist countries. The corresponding figures for the USA were 18.7, the FRG 19.5, Britain 15.2, France 16 and Japan 14.4.¹

As regards the figures for the developing countries of Asia (not to mention Africa) they cannot be even compared with those in the socialist Soviet republics. In Pakistan there are 1.7 certified doctors per 10,000 of the population, in India 2.2, in Turkey 4 and in Iran 3.3.²

Mortality, particularly child mortality, has dropped sharply in Soviet Central Asia as a result of improved medical care and facilities, and is one of the lowest in the world. The fact that Central Asia today has one of the highest rates of population growth (three per cent) is due, as is justly noted in the above UN report³, not only to the high birth-rate, but also to the low mortality rate.

The considerable headway in the field of education has led to a rapid growth of scientific personnel.

The first Central Asian research institutes were established in Uzbekistan. The republic has its own academy of sciences with numerous institutes and laboratories which was opened in 1943 with the assistance of scientists from Moscow, Leningrad, Kharkov and other cities. By the beginning of 1968 Uzbekistan had 353 Doctors and 4,837 Candidates of Sciences. Many of them (219 and 1,526 respectively) were on the staffs of higher educational institutions training new contingents of specialists for the republic.

Today there is an academy of sciences with numerous research institutes and laboratories and well-trained personnel in each of the Central Asian republics. At the end of 1968, 3,077 research workers, including 104 Doctors and 1,053 Candidates of Sciences were employed in the 26 research institutes of the Uzbek Academy of Sciences (numerically the fourth biggest academy of sciences in the USSR);⁴ 1,014 researchers (including 43 Doctors and 335 Candidates

¹ *The USSR and Foreign Countries...*, p. 189.

² *Ibid.*

³ United Nations, E/CN. 5/346/Add. 5/Rev. 1, November 10, 1961, p. 7.

⁴ *The USSR and Foreign Countries...*, p. 231 (in Russian).

of Sciences) in the 18 research institutes of the Kirghiz Academy of Sciences, 872 researchers (31 and 254) in the 16 institutes of the Tajik Academy of Sciences and 644 researchers (17 and 251) in the 16 institutes of the Turkmenian Academy of Sciences.¹

There are major national contingents of scientists in the Central Asian republics. In 1966, 7,900 Uzbeks, 1,200 Kirgizes, 1,900 Tajiks and 1,400 Turkmen were scientific workers.²

The national scientific personnel has been growing much faster in Central Asia than in the Soviet Union as a whole. Compared with 1939 the number of scientific personnel in the USSR in 1966 rose 7.5 times (from 95,900 to 712,400), while the number of Uzbek scientists increased almost 16 times (500 and 7,900 respectively), Kirghizes 30 times (40 to 1,200), Tajiks 13 times (130 to 1,600) and Turkmen 20 times (70 and 1,400).³

In addition to these figures we should like to cite another, living example, disproving the aspersions which are cast on the self-determination of the Central Asian peoples.

In 1970, the public of Kara-Kalpakia, once one of the most backward regions of Central Asia, together with the medical workers of other parts of Uzbekistan marked the 60th birthday of one of the oldest medical specialists of the republic Iskhak Kurbanovich Musabayev.

His biography is typical to many. In his childhood he worked for the landowners. After the October Revolution he, like thousands of other homeless children, was brought up in a state orphanage. His thirst for knowledge brought him into an institution of higher learning. He entered the Samarkand Medical College. But there was a shortage of doctors and medical organisers and Musabayev without discontinuing his studies was appointed deputy head of the Samarkand City Medical Department.

Upon graduation he devoted himself to medical research. The Nazi invasion of the USSR disrupted his personal plans.

¹ *Ibid.*

² *The Land of Soviets in 50 Years*, p. 284 (in Russian).

³ *Ibid.*, p. 286.

He joined the Soviet Army and remained in the armed forces until his demobilisation in 1944. In the army he continued medical research and in 1942 successfully defended his candidate thesis "The Significance of Blood Transfusion in Typhoid and Paratyphoid Cases".

In 1944, two memorable events took place in his life: he joined the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and was made Merited Physician of the Republic on the occasion of the 20th anniversary of Uzbekistan.

After the war he dedicated himself to medical research and organisational activity. He wrote a number of theoretical monographs and in 1951, the scientific council of the USSR Academy of Medical Sciences unanimously awarded him the academic degree of Doctor of Medical Sciences. His lectures at the Advanced Training Institute for Doctors are very popular, particularly with specialists in infectious diseases.

Under his guidance a team of Moscow and Ashkhabad researchers developed methods of simultaneous administration of antibiotics and vaccines in treating typhoid and paratyphoid cases. He has devoted much of his time to the study of the biochemistry of infectious diseases.

Author of seven monographs and over 200 other papers Iskhak Musabayev was elected Corresponding Member of the USSR Academy of Medical Sciences in 1961. Five years later he was elected member of the Uzbek Academy of Sciences. He has been awarded the title of Merited Scientist of the Uzbek SSR and Merited Scientist of the Kara-Kalpak ASSR.

He has trained five Doctors of Sciences and more than 50 Candidates of Sciences and in 1971, another 20 of his pupils defended their theses.

For his vigorous role in promoting Soviet science, training highly qualified scientific personnel and achievements in the field of health protection he has been decorated with the Order of Lenin, two Orders of the Red Banner, the Order of the Badge of Honour and a number of medals. He is the holder of seven Honorary Diplomas of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Uzbek SSR.

Such free and unlimited development of people of labour

and the respect which surrounds them are possible only in conditions of the national liberation of peoples.

Musabayev has always worked for the benefit of his people, he has always been with them and fought for them against the nazi aggressors.

Now let us take a look at Baymirza Hayit, who professes to be a scientist, a specialist in Uzbek and Central Asian history and literature in general, and poses as a champion of "independent Turkestan". By 1944, he had betrayed his country, finished a school for spies and saboteurs, became an SS officer, and on orders from the SS and SD recruited other traitors from among his compatriots in nazi POW camps in an effort to knock together the East Muslim Division SS, the Timur Battalion and other units. Enjoying the full confidence of those who murdered Uzbeks, Russians, Ukrainians, Tajiks, Kirghizes and others, Hayit in 1943 took part in punitive operations in Byelorussia, the Ukraine, France and Italy. In 1944, he published the fawning self-exposing admission: "The enemies of our friend Germany are our enemies...".

Many people found themselves prisoners in the hands of the enemy in the Second World War. What characterises a person, however, is not the fact that he had the misfortune to be taken prisoner, but his loyalty to his country, to his people. There are numerous examples but we shall quote only two. In the summer of 1941, the sick and exhausted Lieutenant-General Dmitry Karbyshev was taken prisoner by the nazis. Neither mental nor physical torture could force this man who was well advanced in years to give in. Having done their utmost to force him to accept their terms and failed the nazis brought him out into the yard of the Mauthausen death camp on a cold winter's day and poured water over him until he froze to death. A true patriot, he chose to die rather than betray his country and his people. A nationalist might say: "But he was a Russian."

Here is another patriot, a Tatar. A young man with a totally different pre-war life, Musa Jalil was a civilian, a Communist and a poet. In the summer of 1942, he was heavily wounded and taken prisoner. Before the year was out he had managed to form an underground organisation in the POW camp. Jalil and his comrades did everything in their

power to break from within the Idel Ural Legion which the nazis were forming out of Tatars and other nationalities living on the banks of the Volga. And they did break it.¹

In August 1943, Jalil was taken by the Gestapo and executed in January 1944. In his last verses published in the collection *Moabit Notebooks*—two small notebooks—he wrote that he “experienced all the horrors of a nazi concentration camp and had not bowed to the fear of forty deaths”. The adamant will and patriotism of one man made mockery of his executioners and defeated death itself. In his last poem the hero, tortured but unvanquished, wrote:

*“Never will you die if you shed blood
Fighting to defend your native parts
Traitors’ blood is spilled to mix with mud
Heroes’ blood burns on in kinsmen’s hearts”.*²

General Karbyshev and Musa Jalil were posthumously made Heroes of the Soviet Union.

Baymirza Hayit was also taken prisoner, but remained alive at the price of vile treachery. He is a traitor.

But neither traitors nor their imperialist masters can divert the Central Asian peoples from their socialist path.

It is this path that brought emancipation to the women of the East, an event of truly historic significance.

There is an old saying: “The degree of freedom enjoyed by women is the natural criteria of freedom in general.”

Having absolutely equal rights with men, the women of Central Asia are confident of their future. What better proof of this is than the extent to which the women of the Soviet East participate in state administration.

There is a high percentage of women in the Supreme Soviets of the Union republics: in Uzbekistan 30.8 per cent (141 women), in Kirghizia 35.4 per cent (120), in Tajikistan 33 per cent (104), in Turkmenia 35.1 per cent (100). Their percentage among the deputies to the local Soviets is still higher:

¹ R. Mustafin, *Poetry of Courage*, Moscow, 1966 (in Russian).

² Musa Jalil, *About Heroism*, Selected Poems, Moscow, 1966, p. 248 (in Russian).

in Uzbekistan 44.7 per cent (37,030 women), in Kirghizia 43.6 per cent (10,412), in Tajikistan 43.9 (8,974) and in Turkmenia 42 per cent (7,768).¹

Here is how the life of the Uzbek women and the role they are playing in society have changed.

Today almost a million women or 45 per cent of the total labour force are employed in the Uzbek national economy, 650,000 of them work at collective farms. An estimated 176,000 women have a higher and secondary specialised education, including 26,000 engineers and technicians. Uzbek women play an especially important role in the field of education and health protection. Nearly 2,000 women are university and college instructors and 7,000 are scientific workers. While before the Revolution only an occasional Uzbek woman had a secondary education, today about 130,000 girls study at schools and institutions of higher learning.

Just forty years ago Uzbek women were restricted to the *ichkari*, the inner part of the house set aside for women and children; they were permitted to leave the house only with a *paranjah*, a thick horsehair net covering their faces. Today 22 of them are deputies of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR and 141 are deputies of the Supreme Soviet of the republic. About 37,000 are deputies of local Soviets, more than 2,000 chairmen, vice-chairmen, secretaries or members of their executive committees and about 20 women are ministers or deputy ministers.²

Yadgar Nasriddinova, the first Uzbek woman engineer, was brought up in an orphanage and then studied at a factory school. For ten years beginning with 1959 she held the highest government post in the republic—Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of Uzbekistan. In 1970, she was elected Chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities, one of the two chambers of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR.

We have quoted a few figures illustrating the achievements of the Central Asian peoples in general and described the lives of some people from the author's native Uzbekistan.

Let us now turn to Kirghizia, the youngest of the Central

¹ *The USSR and Foreign Countries*. . . , p. 29 (in Russian).

² *Soviet Woman*, 1963, No. 3, pp. 18-19 (in Russian).

Asian Union states, and see what it has attained as a result of self-determination on a socialist Soviet basis.

In the sphere of national and state construction the Kirghizes on their way to full self-determination passed through almost all the forms of self-government existing in the USSR. Up to 1924, Kirghizia was a part of the Turkestan Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic. On October 14, 1924, the Kara-Kirghiz Autonomous Region¹ was established within the RSFSR by decision of the All-Union Executive Committee. On May 25, 1925, the All-Union Executive Committee issued a decree renaming it the Kirghiz Autonomous Region. On February 1, 1926, in keeping with the will of Kirghizia, the Central Executive Committee transformed it into an Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic.

On December 5, 1936, Kirghizia acceded to the Treaty of November 30, 1922, establishing the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and became a Union Soviet Socialist Republic, a sovereign socialist state of workers and peasants which voluntarily united with the other constituent republics of the USSR.

In tsarist times the territory of present-day Kirghizia, with a predominantly Kirghiz population, was divided between three regions of the Turkestan Governor-Generalship: the Syr-Darya, Semirechye and Ferghana. Besides, a part of it was ruled by the Emir of Bukhara.

In 1968, 2,925,000 people lived on a territory of 198,500 sq. km. Just as all the republics of the USSR, Kirghizia is a multinational state. Its population consists of more than 80 nationalities, of whom the Kirghizes, according to the 1959 Census, comprised 40.5 per cent, Russians 30.2 per cent and Uzbeks 10.5 per cent.²

Before the Revolution Kirghizia was a backward region where the prevailing feudal relations were even more complicated than in Central Turkestan owing to the survivals of the patriarchal-tribal system that still had a firm hold over the nomadic herdsmen. As regards industry Kirghizia

¹ Kara-Kirghizes was the name given to the Kirghizes before the Revolution, as distinct from the Kazakhs who were then called Kirghizes.

² *The USSR and Foreign Countries...*, p. 292.

had a few primitive coal mines, saltworks and enterprises for the primary processing of animal produce. The economy was confined to backward stock-breeding and primitive farming.

Subject to the double yoke of Russian capital and local feudal lords the Kirghizes were a people deprived of all rights and almost totally illiterate. Those who could read and write had a religious education only. There was not a single secondary specialised educational institution, let alone a college or university. In 1914, the territory of present-day Kirghizia had 107 schools with 7,000 pupils, the children of tsarist officials and local feudal lords.¹ There were no public libraries, theatres and scientific centres. Epidemics and bad sanitary conditions had a dire impact on the birth-rate.

Driven to despair by tsarism's arbitrary rule, extortionate taxes and confiscations of land, the working Kirghizes together with the other Central Asian peoples rose up in 1916, with the revolt assuming particularly great proportions in the north. "The uprising was crushed with extraordinary brutality. Many Kirghizes were killed. Some of the insurgents fled to the neighbouring countries across snow-blocked mountain passes. People and cattle perished and belongings were lost during this difficult trek. Tremendous damage was caused to the economy of the area.

"The Kirghiz population declined sharply as a result of the suppression of the uprising. The position of the Kirghiz people deteriorated to a still greater extent, and losses in cattle reached 60-70 per cent. The enraged tsarist officials strove to force the Kirghizes to move into wild mountain gorges for all time..."²

Modern Kirghizia is an industrial and agrarian state. In 1968, its industrial output was 152 times³ higher than in 1913 (the corresponding figure for the USSR as a whole was 79 times)⁴. In the period under review over 500 major in-

¹ *Forty Years of Soviet Kirghizstan*, Statistical Survey, Frunze, 1966, p. 3 (in Russian).

² S. N. Ryazanov, V. F. Pavlenko, *Kirghiz SSR*, Moscow, 1960, p. 67 (in Russian).

³ *The USSR and Foreign Countries...*, p. 292 (in Russian).

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 43.

dustrial enterprises were built and over 30 new branches of industrial production were established. The republic has become an important producer of mercury and antimony (the best in the world), electric motors, medical equipment, physical apparatuses, metal-cutting machine-tools and farm machinery. Under Soviet power and thanks to it, the republic has started generating electricity and producing oil and gas. It has a modern building, light and food industries. Kirghizia manufactures domestic washing machines, bicycles and other items. Its three-day industrial output today is equal to the amount produced in the whole of 1913.¹ The rates of industrial development in Kirghizia are much faster than in any capitalist country.

Lacking a power industry prior to the Revolution, Kirghizia now annually generates 3,000 million kwh or 1.5 times as much as was produced in the whole of tsarist Russia in 1913. This means that its per capita output of electricity is six times higher than in Iraq, five times higher than in Turkey and 29 times higher than in Pakistan.² The Toktogul Hydroelectric Power Station, which will have a capacity of 1,200,000 kw, is under construction in the republic.

The old sectors have been mechanised with the result that, for example, coal output has risen 37 times. Power industry has been making rapid progress. In 1966, the output of electricity surpassed the 1928 figure by 11,827 times. In the same period the output of engineering and metalworking industry increased 2,268 times and that of the building materials industry 375 times.³

From 1928 to 1966, the gross output of the light industry increased 52 times and of the food industry 70 times, including a 251-fold increase in the production of meat.⁴

As a result of its rapid industrial development the Kirghiz Republic exports its products to more than 50 countries.

Kirghizia is assisting Third World countries, selling machines, lathes, electric appliances and other items to Algeria, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Iran, Yemen, Mali, Egypt, Syria, So-

¹ *Fifty Years of Soviet Kirghizstan*, Frunze, 1967, p. 4 (in Russian).

² *The USSR and Foreign Countries...*, p. 294 (in Russian).

³ *Fifty Years of Soviet Kirghizstan*, p. 43 (in Russian).

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 43-45.

malia, Ceylon and Ethiopia. Tractor rakes and other equipment manufactured by the Kirghiz Farm Machinery Factory have won fame in Algeria.

High quality equipment from Kirghizia has been installed in many laboratories, clinics and hospitals in Algeria, India, Iraq, Pakistan, Somalia, Syria, the Sudan, Ceylon and Ethiopia.

A former colony Kirghizia is now rendering political assistance to the young states and dependent nations. In 1964, for example, the Foreign Minister of Kirghizia, S. V. Begmatova, speaking at the 19th Session of the UN General Assembly, upheld the interests of the peoples fighting against colonialism and neo-colonialism.

Evaluating the example of Kirghizia for the Asian and African countries, Bibiani Oyn, Vice-President of the Health Protection Committee of the Union of Togolese Women, said that the Togolese delegation had visited this republic to see how the Kirghizes lived, and they did see what great things could be accomplished by men who had broken the chains of slavery. She added that upon returning home they would relate their impressions of the Soviet Union, including Kirghizia.

Kirghizia's agriculture has changed radically and today embraces about 250 collective and 90 state farms. They are large economies, each possessing from three to four thousand hectares of sown land.¹ In 1968, the gross agricultural output surpassed the 1913 level by 5.3 times.² The production of cereals increased more than two times, raw cotton six times, potatoes 13 times, meat three times, milk six times, eggs 12 times, etc.³ Moreover, Kirghiz farms are now for the first time cultivating sugar-beet, vegetables, tobacco, food roots and other crops.

Agriculture is highly mechanised. In 1966, there were 26.3 tractors (in terms of 15 hp units), 4.6 combines and a diversity of other equipment per 1,000 hectares of sown land.

Transport, including freight and passenger motor, air and railway transport has developed at a tremendous pace.

¹ *Fifty Years of Soviet Kirghizstan*, p. 73 (in Russian).

² *The USSR and Foreign Countries...*, p. 293 (in Russian).

³ *Ibid.*

In 1967, 115,000 specialists with a higher and secondary specialised education were employed in the Kirghiz national economy compared to 11,000 in 1941.¹ The process of training specialists with priority being given to local people is still continuing. In the ten years beginning with 1957, the number of Russians with a higher education increased two-fold, while the number of Kirghizes increased 2.5-fold and that of Uzheks more than twofold.² Seventy-five per cent of the people with a higher education are below the age of forty.

More than 50 per cent of the people with a higher and secondary specialised education employed in the Kirghiz national economy are women (52.2 per cent)³ of whom Kirghiz women make up 8.1 per cent. But this figure is steadily rising.

The great concern for the development of health protection has led to a sharp drop in the death-rate: from 16 per 1,000 of the population in 1940 to seven in 1966. The death-rate of children under one year of age has declined to a still greater extent, by 75 per cent.⁴ Cholera, the plague, pox, typhoid, malaria, polio, trachoma and other diseases common in Asian, African and Latin American countries, have been wiped out in Kirghizia where there are 5,700 doctors, or one per 500 of the population, compared to one per 43,000 Kirghizes prior to the Revolution. There are more doctors per 1,000 of the population in the republic than in many West European countries or Japan, and 12 times more than in Pakistan, nine times more than in India and from five to six times more than in Turkey or Iran. The average life span in Kirghizia is 70.

In 1913, there were 1.2 hospital beds per 10,000 persons; in 1968, there were 98.9 (a total of 28,900). In this period the size of the medium-level medical personnel increased from 0.3 to over 60 and doctors from 0.2 to 19.5 per 10,000 of the population.⁵

¹ *Fifty Years of Soviet Kirghizstan*, p. 160 (in Russian).

² *Ibid.*, p. 163.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 164.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 185.

⁵ *The USSR and Foreign Countries...*, pp. 293 and 294 (in Russian).

Kirghizia has more health resorts than any other Central Asian republic and operates over 30 sanatoria and rest homes.

Eight-year education is compulsory. Prior to the Revolution Kirghizia did not have a single institution of higher learning or a specialised secondary school. In 1968, one out of every three citizens of the republic studied. There were 723,000 pupils in general education schools, or 103 times as many as in 1913. The number of university and college students increased 12 times compared with 1940.¹ In 1968, more than 83,000 students were enrolled in higher and specialised secondary educational establishments. Now per 10,000 of the population there are 150 students receiving training in one or another of the republic's nine institutions of higher learning. There are twice as many students in Kirghizia as there are in Britain, 1.5 times as many as in France and three times as many as in the Federal Republic of Germany.²

In 1954, the republic established its own Academy of Sciences, and in 1966, it had 4,151 research workers, including 85 Doctors and 1,026 Candidates of Sciences. The number of Kirghizes among them is growing. Of the 1,135 Kirghiz researchers 11 are Doctors and 365 Candidates of Sciences.

A large proportion, 39 per cent, of the research workers in the republic are women. In 1966, 14 of them were Doctors and 264 Candidates of Sciences.

Compared with the pre-revolutionary period the number of cinema units increased a thousandfold. The republic has its own film studios, Kirghizfilm, and six professional theatres, including an opera theatre and a theatre for children.

In 1928, only six newspapers (including in the Kirghiz language) were published in the republic. Their total daily circulation was 51,000. In 1966, 83 newspapers, including 46 in the Kirghiz language, were published with a circulation of 691,000, including 414,000 in the Kirghiz language.

¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 211 and 293.

² *Ibid.*, p. 294.

The republic has made considerable strides in the course of the Eighth Five-Year Economic Development Plan (1966-70). Completing its plan ahead of schedule, Kirghizia increased the gross volume of industrial production 80 per cent and labour productivity 40 per cent.

The republic's industry has attained a new level of development. In the five-year period the engineering industry increased production 2.2 times, the output of the non-ferrous metallurgy rose 2.6 times and the production of power, light and food industries also made considerable headway.

Thirty-seven major industrial enterprises were put in operation and 45 new shops were commissioned at the existing one. Tip-up lorries manufactured at the recently built Frunze Assembly Plant are widely used in Central Asia and Kazakhstan. A large electric hulk factory has been completed in the south of Kirghizia in the lovely town of Maili Sai. Balers made at the Frunze Farm Machinery Plant have won general recognition. Completing its five-year programme the plant has manufactured an experimental batch of modernised machines—hinding hales with twine and not with expensive wire.

The technological progress which is taking place in Kirghizia is due to the rapid growth of investments into its national economy at a rate surpassing the average indicators for the USSR as a whole, the large contingent of highly qualified specialists and the close links between science and production. In the past five-year plan period the republic's industry began to produce 200 new types of commodities and increased the productivity of the traditional sectors of the economy. Rationalisers and innovators are playing a major role in improving production; 63,000 rationalisation proposals have been approved and introduced in production during the period under review.

About a million hectares of farm land are irrigated in Kirghizia. This ensures high yields of cereals, sugar-beet, medicinal herbs and animal fodder with a high albumen content. In the past five-year plan period alone 26,000 hectares of fertile land were added to the irrigated area. The construction has been completed of the Tort-Gul storage lake, the first lake in the USSR to have the bottom covered

with a polyethylene film which reduces the loss of water to the minimum.

All collective and state farms have all the machinery they need. On an average each farm has 120 tractors, motor vehicles and harvester combines. Possessing this farm equipment, mineral fertiliser and specialists the republic has sharply increased the production of staple crops.

Sheep-breeding is the principal occupation of the collective and state farms. In the past five-year plan period the sheep and goat population increased by 1,300,000 and now numbers almost 10,000,000. The death-rate has declined considerably and more of the young now remain alive. This is due to heavy investments into cattle-breeding. Sheds for 2,800,000 head of cattle have been built and as a result sheep-breeding is becoming a highly efficient, mechanised branch of the economy no longer dependent on the weather.

Compared with the preceding five-year plan period the average annual grain yield between 1966 and 1970 increased 45 per cent, sugar-beet 15 per cent, raw cotton 10 per cent, grapes 78 per cent, meat 24 per cent, milk 19 per cent and wool 33 per cent.

Such are the results of national liberation in dry but convincing figures.

The Kirghiz people have friendly relations with many countries. Founded in 1964, the Kirghiz Society for Friendship with Foreign Countries maintains broad relations with 43 countries of Asia, Africa, Latin America and Europe.

Developing at such a tremendous pace within the framework of a single system of the socialist division of labour, the peoples of Central Asia are fully aware of their immediate tasks.

The Directives of the 24th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union for the Five-Year Economic Development Plan of the USSR for 1971-75 state in part:

"A further improvement of the location of the productive forces shall be achieved and territorial economic ties shall be enhanced. The Union Republics and the local Soviets of Working People's Deputies shall be given a bigger role in deciding the location of the productive forces.

"The rational combination of sectoral and territorial planning shall be ensured.

"The further accelerated development of the natural resources of the country's eastern regions and the build-up of their economic potential shall be regarded as an extremely important task in the location of the productive forces and the improvement of territorial proportions in the national economy. In view of the availability of cheap power resources in Siberia, Kazakhstan and Central Asia new power-intensive industries shall be sited chiefly in these areas."¹

What impact will this have on the Central Asian republics?

In the Uzbek Soviet Socialist Republic the volume of industrial production will rise by 46-49 per cent. Power

industry, non-ferrous metallurgy, chemical, gas and light industries will be given a further considerable boost.

There will be a marked increase in the production of irrigation equipment, cotton-picking and other machines for the cotton fields. The production of synthetic fibre will be organised on a large scale. The output of mineral fertiliser will rise 1.6 times, the production of silk fabrics will increase from 2.2 to 2.6 times, knitted underwear 1.8 times, leather footwear 1.5-1.7 times, canned fruits and vegetables 1.6 times, recreation and household goods more than two times, including a 4.2-fold growth in the output of household refrigerators.

The gold-mining industry will be expanded and so will the capacities for the production of zinc and copper at the Almalyk mining and metallurgical combine.

The first units of the Syr-Darya district power stations, the first section of the Almalyk ammonium phosphate factory, capacities for the production of ammonium phosphate at the Samarkand superphosphate factory and a cement factory in Navoi will become operational in this period. Under construction are an electro-chemical works in Navoi and a rubber factory in Angren and the Bekahad metallurgical works is being reconstructed. The Bukhara cotton mill, the Khiva carpet factory, the Fergana artificial leather factory, the Kokand leather factory, a chinaware factory, a number of ginneries, silk-winding, knitted wear, sewing and footwear factories will be commissioned. The construction will be launched of a cotton factory in Andizhan, an oil mill in Urgench and a number of other food industry enterprises will be completed.

Cotton-growing will be further developed, and in 1975, the production of raw cotton will reach 4.9 million tons. Special attention is being paid to increasing the yields of fine-fibred cotton, the introduction of cotton-lucerne crop rotation and raising the cropping capacity of cotton. More rice, fruits, grapes, vegetables, melon crops and tobacco will be cultivated.

The irrigated area will be increased by 465,000 hectares. Measures are being taken to develop a new large cotton-growing region in the Karshi Steppe, expand the irrigated

¹ 24th Congress of the CPSU, Moscow, 1971, p. 296.

area in the Hungry Steppe, the Surkhan-Sherabad Valley and in the Kara-Kalpak Autonomous Republic, and to speed up the construction of the Andizhan storage lake and the Tyuyamuyun Hydropower scheme. Not less than 600,000 hectares of irrigated land will be improved. Further efforts will be made to desalinate and prevent the swamping of the irrigated lands and to improve the water supply of some irrigation systems.

Sheep-breeding, particularly of karakul sheep will be further developed; the average annual wool production will reach 24,000 tons. There will be an increase in the production of meat, milk and eggs. A total of 1,500,000 hectares of pastures will be watered and irrigation facilities will be reconstructed on 3,500,000 hectares of pastures.

In the Kirghiz Soviet Socialist Republic industrial production will increase 45-48 per cent. Power industry, engineering, non-ferrous metallurgy and the light industry will be further developed.

The production of farm machinery will increase 1.7 times, fabrics from 2.9 to 3.3 times, knitted garments 1.7 times and canned vegetables and fruits 1.8 times. And there will be a considerable growth in the output of recreation and household goods.

The Tort-Gul hydroelectric station will be completed and work will be started on the Kurpsai hydroelectric scheme. An electronic computer factory, the second section of the cotton mill, a worsted factory and a meat-packing factory in Tokmak will be built and a farm machinery plant will be reconstructed.

The breeding of fine-fleece and semi-fine-fleece sheep will continue to develop and the average annual wool production will reach 30,000 tons. There will be an increase in the production of meat, milk, tobacco, fruits and vegetables. Thirty thousand hectares of irrigated land will be put to the plough, and Kirovsk and the Tort-Gul storage lakes will be built. Irrigation systems covering 90,000 hectares will be reconstructed and their water supply improved; 400,000 hectares of pastures will be watered, and the water reserves of the existing pastures will be enlarged.

In the Tajik Soviet Socialist Republic industrial production will increase 37-40 per cent, with priority growth ensured for the power, non-ferrous metallurgy and engineering industries.

The production of electricity will increase 2.1 times, mineral fertiliser 1.5 times, cotton fabrics 1.3 times, knitted garments 1.9 times and canned vegetables and fruits 1.5 times. There will be a considerable rise in the production of recreation and household goods.

The construction of the South Tajikistan production complex will be continued; the first units of the Nurek hydroelectric power station and the capacities of aluminium factory and an electrochemical plant will be put into operation. Additional capacities of the Anzob mining and metallurgical combine will become operational and so will the Termez-Kurgan-Tyube-Yavan railway. A trunk gas pipeline leading to Dushanbe will be built. The construction of a synthetic fibre factory in Leninabad and a china factory will be launched. The Kairak Kum carpet factory will be enlarged.

In 1975, Tajikistan will produce 760,000 tons of raw cotton; there will be a growth in the output of fine-fibred cotton, grapes, fruits, vegetables and tobacco. Another 70,000 hectares will be added to the irrigated area. The irrigation and development of the new lands in the Yavan-Obikiik Valley will be completed, and the second section of the irrigation system bringing water to the Dalverzin and the Hungry steppes will become operational. The cattle fodder base will be enlarged and there will be a rise in the production of meat, milk and eggs. A total of 250,000 hectares of pastures will be watered.

In the Turkmenian Soviet Socialist Republic industrial production will increase from 50 to 53 per cent. There will be a sharp rise in gas production and a considerable increase in the rates of development of the oil and chemical industries.

The production of electricity will rise 1.9 times, gas from 4.3 to 4.7 times, oil 1.5 times, fabrics 1.5 times, leather footwear 2.3 times, vegetable oil 1.6 times and canned vegetables and fruits 1.5 times. There will be a considerable growth in the output of recreation and household goods.

Trunk gas pipelines running from the western and eastern regions of the republics to the European part of the USSR will be built, and the first section of the Charjou oil refinery and the first units of the Mari district power station will be put into operation. The complex utilisation of the Kara-Bo-gaz-Gol mineral resources will be improved. The capacities of ginneries will be increased and an oil mill at Charjou will be completed.

In 1975, the republic will produce 900,000 tons of raw cotton; there will be an especially large increase in the production of fine-fibred cotton. Vegetables, grapes and melon crops will be cultivated on a larger scale.

An estimated 105,000 hectares of irrigated land will be put to the plough and another 200,000 hectares of irrigated land will be improved. Land development in the area of the third section of the Kara-Kum Canal will be completed and the construction of this canal will be continued.

It is planned to enlarge the cattle fodder base and to water 3.9 million hectares of pastures. Hydrotechnical facilities will be reconstructed on an area of 2.3 million hectares of pasture lands. The average annual wool production will reach 15,200 tons, and the production of karakul skins, meat, milk and eggs will be increased.

Such will be the giant stride forward, scientifically planned and substantiated by past experience, which will take place in the economy of the Central Asian peoples as they fulfil the current Ninth Five-Year Plan.

Friends, look and emulate their experience!

Enemies, envy and gasp with impotent fury!

11. INVIOABLE FRIENDSHIP OF PEOPLES

Material and technological progress is not the sole achievement of the Central Asian peoples.

Another great historical achievement of the self-determination of the Central Asian peoples that Wheeler, Hayit, Meissner, Caro and others of their ilk are trying to smear is the time-tested friendship of people of different nationalities united in a single close-knit family, and essential factor in the solution of the national question in the USSR and in Central Asia, in particular.

Rooted in the internationalist unity and community of aspirations of the progressive people of Russia and Central Asia, the history of this friendship goes back to the pre-revolutionary times. Enlighteners, free-thinkers from among the local population and exiled revolutionaries, and democratically-minded Russian intellectuals living in Central Asia for diverse reasons, strove to impress upon the people that it is the property status and not their nationality that should divide and does divide people, that a poor Russian was closer to a poor Central Asian peasant than to the factory owner for whom he worked and that when it came to making a choice the wealthy Central Asian landowner exulting in his Mohammedanism would have no remorse in betraying a pious Tajik in order to retain his wealth and position with the assistance of a *giaour*—the Russian tsar.

The working people of any country or nation must be the masters of their land and their future, and living in friend-

ship and understanding overcome all difficulties and share all their joys. Then the world will become what it should be: a tidy garden where every flower is nursed and stretches towards the sun as it grows and blooms and where the great diversity of colours and harmonious blossoming of all flowers gladdens the eye.

Friendship is always forged in trials.

In the difficult years of the Revolution Russian workers and Bolsheviks were firmly on the side of the working people of local nationalities. Together they fought against the British troops who invaded the country to support the counter-revolution consisting of people of diverse nationalities and religions but united by their class interests. Then followed a drawn-out battle against the *basmachi* in which Khamrakul Tursunkulov, a son of an Uzbek peasant and Vassily Glasunov, a Russian, a son of a Tula peasant, fought side by side.¹

The friendship of the Soviet peoples was further cemented by labour and mutual assistance in the period of socialist construction.

This friendship was tempered in the war against the nazis. In the hope of undermining it the nazis enlisted such renegades as Vali Kajum-Han and Baymirza Hayit in their service. For this purpose they formed the Unity Committee of National Turkestan, and for the same purpose this committee is now supported by the CIA and the British intelligence.

But the Great Patriotic War still further strengthened the international unity of the socialist nations.

The war raged on the fields of Russia, the Ukraine and Byelorussia where Uzbeks, Tajiks, Turkmenians and Kirghizes fought side by side with other Soviet people; 67 Uz-

¹ Khamrakul Tursunkulov, thrice Hero of Socialist Labour, was chairman of the Shark Yulduzi Collective Farm for a long space of time and on several occasions was elected Deputy to the Supreme Soviet of the USSR. He died in April 1966 and was buried in the Communist Cemetery in Tashkent.

Having become an officer of the Red Army, Vassily Glasunov proved to be a talented commander. Twice Hero of the Soviet Union, Lieutenant-General, retired, Vassily Glasunov died in August 1967. He was buried in the Novo-Devichye Cemetery in Moscow.

beks, 16 Turkmenians, 15 Tajiks and 12 Kirghizes were made Heroes of the Soviet Union.

It was a grim war. Of the 6,000 men who went to the front from the Akkurgan District near Tashkent, only a half returned. The others were killed at Moscow, Stalingrad, Leningrad, Kharkov, Warsaw, Königsberg and Berlin. They died in those far-off places defending their Uzbekistan, their Soviet homeland, their self-determination. In 1967, the people erected in their memory a thirty-metre obelisk crowned by the republican coat-of-arms on a hill.

The friendship of the peoples of the USSR, which developed as a result of their genuine national liberation attained thanks to the Leninist nationalities policy of the CPSU, has become a great force. In its Declaration of December 30, 1922 on the formation of the Soviet Union, the First Congress of Soviets of the USSR emphasised that to safeguard the republics against an attack by imperialist states and to rehabilitate their economy it was of the "utmost importance to unite the Soviet republics into a single union state capable of ensuring both external security and internal economic progress and freedom of national development."¹ The need to safeguard socialist gains against possible encroachments is still on the order of the day. But now the friendship of peoples has become an organic feature of the life of Soviet society and a fundamental factor in the development of the Soviet state.

A factor of tremendous political and psychological significance, the friendship of the peoples of the USSR has become a powerful material force of the socialist society. Founded on complete equality and genuine self-determination of the peoples, this friendship is producing results which would have been impossible in the conditions of the bourgeois national-egotistic self-determination, that is self-determination under capitalist relations of production.

Here are a few examples.

Let us begin with Tajikistan. "Where there is water, there is life," the Tajiks say, and not only Tajiks but all the peo-

¹ *Fraternal Community of the Peoples of the USSR*, collection of documents and materials edited by I. I. Groshev, Moscow, 1964, p. 47 (in Russian).

ples living in the arid parts of the world, one of which is Central Asia.

Having cast off social and national oppression the people of the young Tajik Republic had to cope with innumerable problems directly connected with water. Without water fertile lands became parched, and so a decision was taken to develop the valley of the principal river in the republic, the turbulent Vakhsh.

Tajiks, Russians, Uzbeks, Kirghizes, Ukrainians, Tatars, Byelorussians and people of other nationalities of the USSR worked shoulder to shoulder. Without such assistance and mutual assistance it would have been impossible to achieve what today all of them regard with pride.

It was a major irrigation project in those days. The parched semi-desert valley received water and turned into a flourishing area, the pearl of the Tajik Republic, the country's principal source of fine-fibred cotton. It is also famous for its orchards, vineyards, melon crop fields and karakul skins. The Gissar, Kulyab and other valleys were also brought back to life. Cities, factories, collective and state farms sprang up on the banks of the Syr-Darya, Zeravshan, Vakhsh, Pyandj, Kafirnigan and Dushanbinka rivers.

At the initial stage industrialisation in Tajikistan developed mostly through the building of light and food industry enterprises on the basis of the developing cotton production and other branches of agriculture. This trend was undoubtedly correct at the time, for it was in line with the actual conditions and possibilities and with the republic's raw materials resources. The rapid progress of industry and agriculture, however, urgently demanded the establishment of a reliable power industry in the republic. One after another the Kairak-Kum, Perepadnaya, Tsentralnaya and Gologovnaya hydroelectric power stations and a large hydroelectric plant in the capital of the republic were built and commissioned. It is difficult to overestimate the beneficial impact of the development of power industry on all aspects of Tajik economy and culture.

But life does not stand still, and the rates and scope of the development of the republic and the laws governing the

country-wide division of labour make it possible to successfully solve still more imposing tasks.

The Vakhsh project showed what great things the Soviet people can accomplish in a socialist community where they have learned to appreciate the full value of international friendship.

The current great changes in the republic are again connected with the Vakhsh, but this time the accent is not so much on irrigation as on the production of inexpensive electricity. This is connected, firstly, with the fact that the Central Asian republics have either turned or are turning from agrarian into industrial-agrarian states, and, secondly, with the utilisation of the hydropower potential of the Vakhsh. Though it is the fourth biggest river in Central Asia, its power potential is one of the greatest in the world and the greatest in the USSR—14,500 kw per 1 kilometre of stream (Noryn—9.3, Amu-Darya—5.3 and Yenisei—4.7 kw).¹

At the end of the fifties, a number of designing organisations in the USSR worked out a plan for the Vakhsh cascade consisting of the Nurek, Ragun, Shurob, Baipazin and Sangtundin hydroelectric power stations with an aggregate capacity of 7.8 million kw. When completed they will generate as much electricity as was generated in the whole of the USSR in the First Five-Year Plan period after the Second World War.

The construction of the cascade was launched in 1961 with emphasis on the Nurek. Economic expediency, however, called for the accelerated construction of the Baipazin project to irrigate the fertile Yavan Valley, lying next to Kara Tau and the mountain range. In the middle of May 1968, a giant controlled blast lifted a mountain of earth and rocks which blocked the turbulent Vakhsh at Kara Tau diverting its waters into a storage lake in the Yavan Valley through a seven-kilometre-long tunnel dug in the mountain by the builders of the Moscow underground. The Baipazin hydroproject, one of the biggest irrigation structures in Central Asia, is now operational. Each second the Vakhsh

¹ In general the rivers of the mountainous Tajikistan have a tremendous power capacity—61 million kw (R.T.).

gives 70 cu m of its waters to irrigate the formerly unused lands.

Today the Yavan Valley, which had pined for water for thousands of years, is a green thriving oasis.

Orchards, vast fields, canals as wide and long as rivers, mountains of cotton. . . . The hills are covered with green plantations and roads are lined with young oaks and Oriental plane-trees.

The young town of Yavan is rapidly expanding. It has straight streets with houses of white stone. There are many people in clubs, cinemas and libraries.

An electro-chemical plant, a heat-and-power plant and other industrial enterprises are being built in the town, and the construction of the Termez-Kurgan-Tyuhe-Yavan railway is in full swing.

The revived land is generously yielding bumper harvests of fruits, grapes and melons. More and more farm machines are seen in the fields and rural construction is proceeding apace.

But the principal wealth of the Yavan Valley is cotton. The mountain dwellers, who had no experience in growing cotton, found the job difficult at first. Now they are specialists in this field thanks to the practical assistance and advice from friends in Gissar and Vakhsh.

The bourgeoning of the Yavan Valley is but the first phase of the great plan whose main project is the Nurek hydroelectric power station which is going up with the concerted efforts of many peoples of the Soviet Union.

The Nurek hydroelectric power station is being built in fulfilment of the Directives of the 23rd CPSU Congress. It was designed by over 100 research and designing organisations throughout the country and with the assistance of many leading scientists and specialists. Its principal structure is a 317-metre-high dam containing 55 million cu m of earth. It will have about 20 kilometres of hydrotechnical and transport tunnels. Ten million cubic metres of rocks will be removed and 80,000 tons of steel sections and equipment assembled.

The Nurek power station on the Vakhsh will have a capacity of 2.7 million kw and will annually generate approx-

imately 12,000 million kwh of inexpensive electricity. The surface area of the storage lake will be 95 sq km. A 500,000-volt transmission line will run from the Nurek power station to Tashkent across several mountain ranges to bring electricity to Central Asian towns and villages.

The Nurek power station will tremendously promote the development of the South-Tajik economic complex and the productive forces of the other Central Asian republics.

Its significance for irrigation is also considerable. At present 1.28 million hectares of land, of which 780,000 hectares are under cotton plantations, are being cultivated along the Amu-Darya which gets a third of its waters from the Vakhsh. In winter and spring, when glaciers practically cease thawing, cotton fields are invariably short of water.

The Nurek storage lake with a capacity of 10.5 cu km of water will hold back the water during the period of the most intensive thawing of glaciers and will regularly portion it out through the turbines into the lower reaches of the Vakhsh and the Amu-Darya. In the autumn and winter the natural flow will be augmented by 300 cu m of water per second and in the spring by 500 cu m which will ensure the uninterrupted functioning of all irrigation systems.

The seasonal regulation of the Vakhsh will perceptibly improve the flow of water into the Kara-Kum, Amu-Bukhara and the Karshin canals and into the lower reaches of the Amu-Darya.

Directly from the storage lake the water will flow through a 13-kilometre-long gravity tunnel into the Dangarin Valley in Tajikistan where there are approximately 100,000 hectares of land suitable for cultivating the best sorts of cotton. The completion of the new hydropower station will make it possible to water new lands and improve the irrigation of 1.5 million hectares.

Another important problem is being solved. Each year the Vakhsh carries about 50 million cu m of sand and silt into the Amu-Darya a tenth of which is deposited in the irrigation systems. Thousands of people and hundreds of excavators and bulldozers are annually engaged in clearing the canals and irrigation ditches. The Nurek storage lake will

hold back the bulk of the sediments and clarified water will flow into the irrigation network.

The construction of large chemical enterprises in Tajikistan is closely connected with the creation of the Nurek industrial complex. A factory for the production of carbamide, an excellent fertiliser, has been built on the Vakhsh a few years ago. It meets in part the requirements in nitrogenous fertiliser of the farms in Tajikistan and Surkhan Darya region of Uzbekistan. The expensive transportation of fertiliser from other parts of the country to Central Asia has been considerably reduced.

The second chemical enterprise will be the Yavan electrochemical plant. It is being built in the vicinity of enormous deposits of common salt, dolomites and limestone and will use the inexpensive electricity of the Nurek Hydroelectric Power Station. The plant will produce a dozen or so chemical products, including calcined ash, caustic soda and calcium carbide. The first section will become operational in 1973.

The new town of Yavan, with a population which will soon reach the 120,000 mark, will become the site of enterprises of the light, food and meat and milk industries. The huge shops of the mechanical repair works have already been built and the capacities of the building industry are being enlarged. Two units of the Yavan heat-and-power station have been put into operation. Housing is being built. The construction of the Dushanbe-Yavan gas pipeline is nearing completion.

The Tajik aluminium plant, which will be a modern enterprise in the full sense of the word, will be the principal recipient of the inexpensive electricity generated by the Nurek Hydroelectric Power Station.

The Nurek power and industrial complex also includes the above-mentioned Termez-Kurgan-Tyube-Yavan railway which will run across three valleys—the republic's principal cotton-growing areas—which already has a considerable freight turnover.

The Nurek project has entered the pre-completion phase. At the end of 1972, two of its units will begin generating power for industrial needs making it possible to launch the

first section of the aluminium plant and channel up to 1,000 million cu m of water for irrigation purposes.

In the future still bigger power and industrial complexes will be built in mountainous Tajikistan.

It is clear that Tajikistan alone would have been unable to undertake the construction of such a vast project.

People of 42 nationalities, including those of the Central Asian republics, Russians and Ukrainians, are working on the Nurek project. Tajiks and Uzbeks account for 50 per cent of the qualified personnel. Builders of the Moscow underground, drift miners from the coal-mines of Donetsk and Chermkhovo, assembly men from the Urals and Siberia, building workers from Tashkent and Alma Ata work together with the Tajiks. The entire country is generously assisting Tajikistan with trainloads of excavators, cranes, drilling equipment, powerful motor vehicles, lorries, pipes and other items.

Another example is Turkmenia.

Once Mustafa Chokayev ridiculed the bold plans of irrigating and developing the Kyzyl-Kum and Kara-Kum, the biggest deserts in the Soviet Union. Now the Uzbek, Turkmenian and Kazakh republics have pooled their efforts and, with the assistance of the Union Government, are carrying into effect the grandiose plan of irrigating them. The Kara-Kum and the Kyzyl-Kum canals are cutting farther and farther into their expanses, new storage lakes are being filled and hundreds of wells dug.¹ These canals have become the subjects of songs and musical compositions.²

People of 36 fraternal nationalities are taking part in building the Kara-Kum Canal, one of the biggest projects under way in the USSR. Equipment and machines for it come from more than 100 cities of the multinational Soviet state. The length of the canal has already reached 850 km. It will connect Amy-Darya with the Caspian Sea, bringing water to regions in Turkmenia rich in oil, gas and other

¹ Fifteen huge fresh-water underground seas have been discovered in the Kyzyl-Kum desert.

² A. Kuliev, a Turkmenian composer, was awarded in 1968 the State Prize of the Turkmenian SSR for his cantata *Kara-Kum River*.

minerals. Already today it supplies drinking water to dozens of big and small towns in the republic and irrigates almost 250,000 hectares of land.

The Kara-Kum Canal has already begun to transform the adjoining desert areas, including the ancient land of Hauz-khan, once parched and lifeless.

Today it is hard to imagine that not long ago caravans and flocks of sheep used to bypass this part of the desert. In 1831, struggling through the drifting sands of the Kara-Kum, Lieutenant Burns of the East India Company said that the Indian desert was nothing compared with this ocean of sand and that he could not imagine anything more horrible than this desert. Those following Burns's road today will see the gleaming surface of the huge Hauzkhani storage lake horn of the waters of the Lenin Kara-Kum Canal. Here the desert smells of water plants. The boats are laden with the night catch: carps, tolstolob, sheat-fish and other species of fish which are delivered to Ashkhabad, Mari, Bairam-Ali and other towns of the republic. . . .

Bright pin-points of light float over the dark surface of the lake where teams of Turkmenian (!) fishermen are out on night fishing.

Maksud Kurbanov has been leader of one of the best teams of Turkmenian fishermen on Hauzkhani for a number of years now. A father of eight children, he had fought in the Second World War. A skilled carpenter, he was in his forties when he became a fisherman, an occupation formerly unknown in these parts.

The inhabitants of the neighbouring Mari and Tedjen oases had never been fishermen in the past. Now fishing is a widespread occupation and is conducted the year round. Local winters are usually mild and the lake now abounds in tolstolob, White Amur, sheat-fish, sandre, and barbus.

Not far from the camp of Maksud Kurbanov's team are the lights of a team headed by Boris Safaryants, his old friend and "rival" in the socialist emulation.

Safaryants, too, became a fisherman when he had already reached middle age. He was a lorry driver and delivered mail, newspapers and food to the fishermen. Once, when his lorry was written off he decided to fish for a week or two

pending the arrival of a new one. He liked the work so much that he decided to change his occupation. A native of lolotani, a small town on the fringe of the desert, Boris Safaryants who had seen the sea only in the films, is now one of the best fishermen in the republic.

A township has mushroomed at the foot of the dam on the bank of an offtake canal. It is the home of the workers, engineers and technicians of the Hauzkhani hydro-project, headed by Lenin Prize winner Aman Chorliyev.

In January 1971, the storage lake held almost 500 million cu m of Amu-Darya water. The length of the dam is 32 kilometres. The Hauzkhani reservoir is larger than the Tsimlyanskoye Sea. By 1971, its waters were irrigating 50,000 hectares, or approximately a sixth of the total irrigated area in Turkmenia.

The third stage of the construction of a man-made sea in the desert was launched in 1971. When completed the reservoir will hold 875 million cu m of water which will irrigate up to 100,000 hectares.

Now state farm villages and fields line the banks of the 850-kilometre-long Kara-Kum Canal.

The development of the Hauzkhani Valley is being conducted at a rapid pace. A ginnery has been built here. The whole country is taking part in building Hauzkhani. Turkmenians, Russians, Uzbeks, Ukrainians, Georgians, Azerbaijanians, Tatars and people of many other nationalities are operating the latest machines and equipment made in Gorky, Sverdlovsk, Ashkhabad, Moscow and the neighbouring Central Asian republics.

. . . In their songs the *bakhshi*, Turkmenian bards, have always sung about the people's dream of transforming the desert. Now this dream has become a reality. The shrill gulls swoop over the sand dunes. The former *kumli*, people of the sands, who had heard about fish only in fairy-tales, have created a nursery in the desert which annually produces up to 100 million fry of carps and carplike fishes.

The canal has abundantly repaid the people for their labour and the state received a generous return for each invested ruble. The Kara-Kum Canal has turned Turkme-

nia into a major cotton-producing region which now holds second place in the USSR for the output of raw cotton.

This is how water, which, the Turkmenians say, "is more precious than diamonds, and is life itself", has transformed the Kara-Kum desert.

Such is the changed and changing land of the new, socialist Turkmenia. Fifty years ago the British invaded its territory and during their short period of occupation caused great suffering to its people and tremendous damage to its economy. Together with the other fraternal peoples of Central Asia and Russia, the Turkmenians drove the aggressors out and are now benefiting from the fruits of the socialist friendship of the peoples of the USSR.

The combined and co-ordinated efforts of the Uzbek, Turkmenian and Kazakh republics have turned the Kyzyl-Kum and Kara-Kum into a magnificent pasture, the country's principal karakul-raising region.

Take the Kyzyl-Kum, for example. This grim desert is surrendering to the onslaught of man. As a result of fifty years of work by scientists and ploughmen, a million hectares have been wrested away from it. Grasses and shrubs carefully selected by botanists have replaced the wind-driven sand. In the south of the desert 3-metre-high *saksaut* groves reliably protect the fields from the sand-drifts, making it possible to develop regions which had been regarded as lifeless just a short while ago. Motor roads and railways cut across the desert where townships and towns have sprung up. Fifty collective farms are using the desert as pastureland whose grasses are excellent fodder for karakul sheep. Leading into the desert from the Amu-Darya are a 200-kilometre-long canal with powerful pumping stations and a 172-kilometre-long pipeline carrying water to the oilfields of Gazli; a 200-kilometre-long water-main is being built to supply the gold-mining centre of Zeravshan with water.

Melioration and irrigation are promoting the development of new fields and meadows in the steppes.

In recent years the deserts have been giving generously of their mineral wealth. On September 23, 1956, gas roared out of well No. 1 drilled by Mansur Hojayev at Gazli, near

Bukhara. Further survey established that the deposits contained 500,000 million cu m of gas. But it proved to be only one of the more than 30 gasfields of the vast Bukhara-Khiva oil-bearing province which today yields the bulk of the gas obtained in the USSR. Together with the Gassar, Ust Yurt and Mangyshlak (a rich oil province) this region holds prospects for a combined development of the Uzbek and Turkmenian oil and gas industry.

Only combined efforts will make it possible to develop such wealth in the minimum space of time for the great benefit of the whole country. Less than 20 years have passed since gas was discovered in Gazli, but several main gas pipelines already cross the deserts: Bukhara-Urals pipeline, Central Asia-Centre, Djarkak-Tashkent, Bukhara-Alma Ata-Frunze. In the seventies it is planned to build hundreds of kilometres of the second section of the Central Asia-Centre gas pipeline and to begin the construction of the third section which will be over 2,500 kilometres long.

The annual production and transportation of Central Asian gas will be brought up to 12,000 million cu m by 1975. This will be achieved through the collective efforts of the Soviet republics. To date 3,000 kilometres of high-voltage transmission lines and also several railways and motor roads have been built.

Soviet people have also co-operated in the discovery and development of another rich mineral deposit in the deserts. In the post-war period the biggest gold-bearing province in the USSR embracing several deposits was discovered in Muruntau, in the heart of the Kyzyl-Kum desert. It is now the site of the country's biggest ore-dressing plant and the budding town of Zeravshan which means "Carrying Gold".

The forecasts made by the great Russian scientists A. P. Fedchenko, V. A. Obrucbev and I. V. Mushketov have proved to be correct. New mineral deposits are being discovered in Uzbekistan. Prospecting is being conducted by many of the country's organisations. Scarcely a decade passed since the gold was discovered in Muruntau, when two more rich deposits of gold were discovered in the slopes of Kurama range: in Chadak (on the side overlooking the Fergbana

Valley) and in the vicinity of Angren, close to Uzbekistan's principal coal-fields. Both deposits have become gold-mining centres with the country's lowest production costs. A third gold deposit was discovered soon afterwards, this time in the mountains near ancient Samarkand.

* * *

There have been cases when Central Asian republics transferred a part of their territories to each other, and on one occasion the Turkmen Republic transferred a part of its territory to Iran. This was done in keeping with the general state interests of the USSR. Such issues in the Soviet Union do not give rise to complications which are characteristic of Africa, for example.

What other proof is needed of the stability and effectiveness of the friendship of peoples engendered by the genuine national liberation of the Central Asian peoples.

The friendship and selfless mutual assistance of the Soviet peoples, a major achievement and evidence of the correctness of the nationalities policy pursued by Soviet power, were further manifested during the disaster that recently befell the capital of Soviet Uzbekistan.

The earthquake, which struck Tashkent on April 25, 1966, destroyed about 2,000,000 sq m of housing, leaving 78,000 families homeless. A total of 35,000 houses, hundreds of schools, children's institutions and medical establishments were either destroyed or damaged. In the course of two years there were 825 earth tremors. Writing in *Pravda* on April 26, 1968, the Tashkent journalist Y. Mukimov justly noted that there was hardly another city in the world on which the elements had showered such a vast number of blows.

The peoples of the Soviet Union came to Tashkent's help. The scope and scale of their assistance was unprecedented. With their own manpower, means and materials Moscow built 230,000 sq m of housing in Tashkent, Leningrad—100,000 sq m, other cities of the RSFSR—330,000 sq m, the Ukraine—160,000, Byelorussia—25,000, Kazakhstan—28,000, Georgia—over 24,000, Azerbaijan—35,000, Lithuania—10,000, Moldavia—6,000, Latvia—over 7,000, Kirghizia—

over 11,000, Tajikistan—8,000, Armenia—15,000, Turkmenia—9,000, Estonia—over 5,000 sq m of housing.¹

Within a year after the April earth tremor, builders who had arrived to Tashkent from all the Soviet republics built approximately a million square metres of housing. In April 1967, there were on an average a hundred house-warming parties in the city daily.

In the centre of the city the Moscow workers built an ensemble of multi-storeyed buildings and close to them a hotel which was named *Rossiia* (Russia).

In those days Georgian builders erected an obelisk in one of the city's avenues. It bears the words of the great Georgian poet Shota Rustaveli: "A man needs a friend in days of misfortune and adversities. . ."

By 1971, as a result of the combined efforts of the Soviet peoples a total of 3,500,000 sq m of housing had been built in the city.

Commending their active participation in overcoming the destruction caused by the earthquake and their fraternal assistance and selfless labour in rebuilding the city, the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR on July 10, 1969 awarded orders and medals to 492 workers, technicians, engineers and employees of building and assembly organisations from Union and autonomous republics, territories, regions and cities and also a group of Soviet Army servicemen.

Only the government of a country such as the Soviet Union, where everything is done to foster and strengthen the international friendship of peoples, is capable of thinking so highly of those who manifest it.

Driving through the streets, avenues and squares of the reborn Tashkent, it is impossible to suppress a feeling of pride for the socialist Soviet Union, a country of the great fraternity of people of different nationalities fused into a single whole by the community of interests and ideology, by their patriotism and who are guarding their friendship as the apple of their eye, as Lenin had taught them to do.

¹ S. Rashidov, *Banner of Friendship*, Moscow, 1967, p. 222 (in Russian).

Speaking at the 24th Congress of the CPSU, First Secretary of the Communist Party of Uzbekistan, prominent Soviet writer Sharaf Rashidov declared in this connection: "All Soviet republics extended a hand of fraternal assistance to the people of Tashkent. A truly heroic epic of the peoples began...."

"...And the reborn Tashkent will stand for ever as a majestic symbol of the inviolable fraternity of Soviet peoples, as a symbol of the boundless gratitude of the people of Uzbekistan to the Central Committee of our Leninist Party and our Soviet Government.

"The people of the republic will always retain in their hearts the most profound gratitude to all peoples-brothers, for their friendly support and selfless assistance.

"...The Uzbek people have deeply felt the magic strength of the fraternal friendship of peoples. It brought them a free and joyous life. In it they see a reliable guarantee of their further burgeoning. And they treasure it as the apple of the eye."¹

The collective work of the Central Asian scientists and scientists from other republics which has been developing in the post-war period has been one of the results of the national liberation achieved through socialist revolution.

The Central Asian republics have over a hundred research institutes and other scientific organisations, four academies of sciences, several hundred sectoral research institutes and more than 30,000 scientific workers, and this enables them to jointly tackle and solve major scientific problems on the basis of their fraternal socialist international relations.

In 1967, they completed the first phase of the creation of the scientific foundations of the general plan for the development and distribution of the productive forces in the Central Asian economic area. Now they are in the middle of the second phase, charting the plan for the period ending 1980.

They have examined the general concepts of the development of the Central Asian productive forces, the outline development of its main sectors—irrigation, cotton-growing,

¹ *Izvestia*, April 1, 1971.

gas production, non-ferrous metallurgy and others—and the pattern of the interrelationship of the economies of the republics and examined variants of the most effective siting of production capacities with the view to a more efficient utilisation of the natural and labour resources.

The republics have pooled their efforts in studying and drafting a plan for the comprehensive development of the Central Asian deserts.

They are working on problems of the collective utilisation of the natural wealth of the Ferghana Valley (for Uzbekistan, Kirghizia and Tajikistan), of the lower reaches of the Amu-Darya (for Uzbekistan and Turkmenia), the Hungry Steppe (for Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan and Tajikistan).

The first steps have already been made in the joint study of the history of socio-political thought and the culture of the Central Asian peoples and their struggle for national liberation and social emancipation which they waged under the guidance of the Communist Parties. A fundamental work on the victory of Soviet power in Central Asia and Kazakhstan was published in 1967 under the auspices of five academies of sciences on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of Soviet power. This book is about the birth of a new world on the land of the fraternal peoples of the USSR, about the historical experience of the socialist revolution which for the first time in history triumphed in former colonies, about the development of the peoples towards socialism bypassing capitalism and about the co-operation, mutual assistance and Leninist friendship of the peoples who have chosen the road of freedom and communism and achieved historic victories in their development.

Specialists in Central Asia and Kazakhstan are jointly summarising the experience of socialist construction in these republics.

* * *

Such are some of the results of the national liberation achieved by the Central Asian peoples. It was history's first and genuine self-determination. National in form it was the self-determination of the working people in content, and

all the benefits arising from it went first and foremost to the people themselves.

It has levelled up the social, economic and cultural development of the Central Asian peoples and enabled them rapidly to attain the level of the Russian, Ukrainian and some other peoples of the USSR who in their time had forged ahead. This process has led to the formation of the foundation of the Soviet Union—the friendship of peoples cemented not only by their full and genuine equality, but also by their social, ideological and political unity and community of their aims.

* * *

Reviewing the results of the fifty years' development of the USSR, the CPSU Central Committee justly noted that *"through their long years of experience all the peoples of the country have become assured of the rich fruits which their cohesion in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics yields and the great opportunities which it opens before them"*.¹

Today the USSR is a highly advanced socialist society.

The national economy has reached a high level of development. This economy is an interconnected complex including the national economies of the republics and developing on the basis of a single state plan in the interests of the country as a whole and each individual republic.

The class and national antagonisms have been abolished. The society as a whole and each nation and nationality have an identical social structure consisting of the working class, the collective farm peasantry and the working intelligentsia.

The all-round development of the Union statehood and the national statehood of the republics is an integral process taking place on the basis of the principles of democratic centralism and socialist federalism and Soviet socialist democracy.

All the necessary conditions for the active participation of the people of all nationalities in furthering science, technology and culture have been created, and the flowering, the

drawing together and the mutual enrichment of the cultures of the socialist nations and nationalities have become an established fact.

The ideology of Marxism-Leninism, socialist internationalism and friendship of peoples has become firmly embedded, an intensive exchange of personnel and spiritual and material values is in progress, and mutual influence and internationalisation of the entire mode of life of the peoples is mounting. Today the population of each republic is a multinational collective in which national features blend organically with international and socialist, general Soviet traits and traditions.

A new historical community of people, the Soviet people, took shape in the USSR in the period of socialist construction. This community emerged on the basis of public ownership of the means of production, oneness of the economic, socio-political and cultural life, Marxist-Leninist ideology and the interests and the communist ideals of the working class. Characteristic of Soviet people are dedication to the communist cause, socialist patriotism and internationalism, industriousness, energetic socio-political activity, class solidarity with the working people of all countries and an intolerance of exploitation and oppression and of national and racial prejudices. Generations of genuine internationalists, selfless builders of communist society, have grown up in our country. All the necessary material and spiritual conditions for the further development of the creative abilities of every Soviet person and the all-round development of the individual have been created in the USSR.

¹ *Pravda*, February 22, 1972.

12. IN LIEU OF A CONCLUSION

Delivering the Report of the CPSU Central Committee to the 24th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, Leonid Brezhnev underlined: "We are living under conditions of an unabating ideological war, which imperialist propaganda is waging against our country, against the world of socialism, using the most subtle methods and powerful technical means. All the instruments that the bourgeoisie has of influencing the minds—the press, cinema and radio—have been mobilised to delude people, make them believe that under capitalism they are living in a near-paradise, and slander socialism."¹

In this book we have cited facts and figures refuting a "local" trend in anti-Soviet calumny, one which at the same time pursues a definite international political purpose—to discredit in the eyes of the world, and especially in the eyes of the developing countries, the experience of genuine national liberation and social emancipation of the Central Asian peoples from bourgeois and landowner oppression under tsarism.

Summing up and supplementing what we have already said, we should like to take up three of the six most widespread trends in the slander directed against the national policy of the CPSU mentioned in Chapter II. These trends are intended to drive a wedge between the national libera-

¹ *Pravda*, March 31, 1971.

tion movement and the developing countries, on the one hand, and the socialist world headed by the Soviet Union, on the other.

Some of these trends were rebuffed by delegates of the Central Asian peoples at the 24th Congress of the CPSU.

Since in its propaganda anti-Sovietism attaches paramount significance to what it calls the problem of Russification, let us look into it first.

It should be noted that the intermixing of peoples has always been a natural process. The rate and the scope of its development increasingly depend on the growth of trade and economic relations between states and peoples, the improvement of the technical means of communications between them, the drawing together, the mutual enrichment of their cultures, and so forth. This, for example, is evidenced by the increasing number of mixed marriages in all countries.

As regards the Soviet Union, this process cannot but acquire a still greater scope and scale in view of the rapid and planned industrial development of huge territories in Siberia, the Far East and Kazakhstan, which had been either devoid of population or sparsely populated in the past. Moreover, it is an objective law of Soviet society.

At the same time, in rebuffing the falsifiers, it should be said that the mixing of peoples as a natural trend is typical not so much of the Central Asian republics as of the Russian Federation. This can be seen from the 1970 Census. In eleven years (from 1959 to 1970) the percentage of Russians in the RSFSR fell from 83.3 to 82.8 per cent. In the same period in the Central Asian republics and Kazakhstan the percentage of the nationals who gave these republics their names increased and that of the Russians dropped. Since 1959, the percentage of Uzbeks in Uzbekistan rose from 61.1 to 64.7 and that of Russians declined from 13.5 to 12.5; in Kazakhstan the corresponding figures were 29.8-32.4 and 43.2-42.8; in Kirghizia 40.5-43.8 and 30.2-29.2; in Tajikistan 53.1-56.2 and 23-23; in Turkmenia 60.9-65.6 and 17.3-14.5.

This trend is not at odds with the above-mentioned objective law of the development of Soviet society.

Moreover, the 1970 Census contains data about languages showing that what is actually taking place in Central Asia is neither assimilation nor Russification but a *voluntary drawing together* of nations, characteristic solely of Soviet society. This is manifested by the fact that the number of nationals who have given their name to a particular republic and who consider its language as their native language has increased in all the republics. The corresponding figures for 1959 and 1970 (in per cent) are: Uzbeks 98.4 and 98.8, Tajiks 98.1 and 98.5, Turkmenians 98.9 and 98.9, Kirghizes 98.7 and 98.9, Kara-Kalpaks 95 and 96.6 and Uighurs 85 and 88.5. At the same time the number of nationals speaking fluent Russian is growing. In 1970, there were (per cent of the total): Uzbeks 14.5, Tajiks 15.4, Turkmen 15.4, Kirghizes 19.1, Kara-Kalpaks 10.4 and Uighurs 35.6.

Finally, to disprove the slanderous allegations about Russification it is necessary to mention the dispersion of the peoples of Central Asia, a new tendency but one fully in keeping with Soviet reality. According to the census figures, of the 9,195,000 Uzbeks 1,461,000 live outside their republic; the figures for the Kazakhs, Tajiks, Turkmen and Kirghizes are 1,138,000, 506,000, 108,000 and 167,000 respectively. Experienced in anti-Sovietism writers such as Newth and the traitor Hayit would probably reply that though these thousands of people do live outside their republics, they nevertheless have remained in Central Asia in the republics which were established as a result of the national delimitation of 1924 and the territorial changes which had taken place there in the following years.

They would be wrong, however. The fact of the matter is that a small, though growing proportion of these peoples who have been attached to their land for centuries is now settling down outside of Central Asia. As of January 15, 1970, a total of 75,000 Uzbeks (0.8 per cent) lived outside Central Asia and Kazakhstan; 490,000 (478,000 in the RSFSR) Kazakhs (9.2 per cent); 27,000 Tajiks (1.2 per cent); 37,000 Turkmen (2.4 per cent) and 21,000 Kirghizes (1.5 per cent).¹

¹ Estimated on the basis of the 1970 Census (*Izvestia*, April 16, 1971).

Looking over these estimates an anti-Soviet writer like Godfrey Lias, who published his *Kazakh Exodus* in 1956 in London, might be tempted to call this an exodus, too. But that is not so, of course. This dispersion has been the result of the voluntary movement of the population and the demographic consequence of the profound social, and not solely a political, factor engendered by the Soviet system and known as friendship of peoples.

Speaking at the 24th CPSU Congress the First Secretary of the Communist Party of Kirghizia T. Usubaliyev noted that the ideological minions of imperialism... are brazenly and shamelessly spreading malicious and slanderous allegations that the position of the Central Asian republics is unequal in the USSR, that their peoples are being Russified. "Our Soviet reality," he said, "completely overturns all the slanderous fabrications of imperialist propaganda. All the attempts by the imperialists and their ideologists, Left- and Right-wing revisionists, all brands of nationalists and Zionists and Peking splitters to weaken the unity and friendship of the Soviet peoples are doomed to failure."²

As L. I. Brezhnev justly noted: "On the socialist horizon all nations, whether big or small, shine like stars of the first magnitude."²

The second trend in anti-Soviet slander is to impute the existence of "Soviet colonialism". The numerous facts cited in the book completely disprove these allegations. At this juncture we should merely like to examine the Sovietologists' position on this issue in retrospect. Its "evolution" sheds sufficient light on the actual objectives of the Western "critics". In their early "critical" works, written in the twenties, they completely denied the very possibility of economic development in Central Asia under Soviet power and ridiculed the plans to the effect (Chokayev, Castagné). Then, in the thirties, when this development and these plans became a reality, they alleged that Central Asia had remained a colonial, cotton appendage of Russia with the only difference that cotton production had been enlarged, but that the

¹ *Izvestia*, April 4, 1971.

² *Pravda*, March 31, 1971.

same could not be said of industry (Bugra, Chagadal, Chokayev).

Later, in the forties, when progress in agriculture in Central Asia was supplemented by the development of the manufacturing and engineering industries, the "critics" began to say that Soviet power was promoting economic growth in the area in order to intensify its colonial policy of squeezing more out of Central Asian agriculture and natural resources.

And when in the fifties and sixties the peoples of Central Asia entered a period of still greater and more comprehensive industrial, agricultural and cultural development, as a result of which, according to the UNO, they achieved amazing results in the field of health protection and education and were only behind Israel and Japan among the Asian states in the level of industrial production and living standards (as the prominent Sovietologist Wheeler wrote), these "critics" again claimed that Soviet power was doing all this for the sake of colonialism.

Clearly, the anti-Soviet writers are constantly retreating.

It would be interesting to know what they will be writing in 1976 when the Soviet Union, including the Central Asian republics, will have accomplished the tasks set in the Directives of the 24th Congress of the CPSU for the Ninth Five-Year Economic Development Plan. Let us not engage in guess-work. But undoubtedly, judging by their preceding practice, they will continue to manoeuvre to adjust themselves to the magnificent achievements of the Central Asian peoples and to call white black.

It is equally certain that the Central Asian republics will not deviate from their chosen road of socialist development. They can answer the calumniators in the words of an Eastern saying: "The dog barks, but the caravan continues on its way". Having built socialism in the friendly family of Soviet peoples, the peoples of Central Asia will build communism as members of a still more consolidated multinational community of Soviet peoples. Addressing the 24th CPSU Congress First Secretary of the Communist Party of Turkmenia M. Gapurov said: "... our ideological opponents are ever more frequently spreading malicious fabrications about the

so-called Soviet colonialism in Central Asia, about the allegedly unequal status of the Central Asian republics in the Soviet Union. ... The malicious slander and demagogic wails of the bourgeois falsifiers cannot hide the truth from the peoples of the world and are, moreover, helpless to stop the objective historical process—the free and ever accelerating development of the Central Asian republics within the multinational Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, they are helpless to impede the hourgeoning and the drawing together of all Soviet nations."¹

Finally, we turn to the third trend. As distinct from the others it is a relatively new one in anti-Soviet slander. In effect it is a series of variations on the theme that Central Asian peoples are allegedly deprived of the right to self-determination in practice. The stratagem here is that the right to self-determination is presented solely as the right to secession.

In this connection we should like to refer the reader to Article 17 of the Constitution of the USSR which legally ensures the right to secession to all Union Republics.

The "critics" should also be reminded of the common truth which has been recorded in a number of UNO decisions. One of them, the "Declaration on Principles of International Law Concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in Accordance with the Charter of the United Nations" unanimously adopted at the 25th Anniversary Session of the General Assembly, states that the right to self-determination is not only the right to secession but also the right of all peoples freely to determine their "political status and to pursue their economic, social and cultural development".²

Thirdly, being true Marxists and genuine internationalists the Communists do not regard any general democratic principle, including the right to self-determination, as an absolute, but as a means of achieving and defending democracy and the class interests of the working people. Otherwise, any such principle, if considered without regard for its

¹ *Izvestia*, April 4, 1971.

² UN, A/2625/XXV.

aims, may become an instrument of reaction, as history knows very well.

For the Marxists the right of nations and peoples to self-determination is, in the final count, one of the means of ensuring the class self-determination of the working people. In other words, it is determined by the class interests of the working people. Is this class approach to the issue a new development? Not at all, a class approach has accompanied this right ever since it was introduced. Only the bourgeoisie has always regarded the class approach as a means of using this right to uphold its own interests in the class policy with regard to the working people of a given nation, and in the struggle against the bourgeoisie of other countries.

Incidentally, from the point of view of modern international law, too, the right to self-determination, including the right to secession, is not an absolute. According to the above-mentioned UN Declaration these principles are interrelated and each principle "should be construed in the context of the other principles", namely: the ban on the threat or use of force, peaceful settlement of international disputes, non-interference in the internal affairs of other states, their sovereign equality and fulfilment in good faith by the states of the obligations assumed by them in accordance with the UN Charter.

Fourthly, as it follows from the above, the enemies of the Soviet Union by slandering the right of the Central Asian peoples to self-determination, are in effect interfering in the internal affairs of the USSR and thus make their governments abettors of infringement of international law.

Fifthly, the peoples of the Soviet Union are free to secede, but they do not wish to do so, for in the right to self-determination they have taken advantage of what is the most important—the free choice of the socialist system and have for ever united together to consolidate this freedom. Their right to self-determination is inalienable, but to exercise it as the right to secession runs counter to the national, social and class interests of any people and all peoples of the USSR. Though timely and progressive for the peoples who are casting off the colonial yoke of imperialism, it is reactionary for

the peoples of the USSR, who are jointly building communist society. They have carried out self-determination of the highest order—national self-determination of the working people. It was this self-determination that created the monolithic unity of all nations and nationalities of the USSR and led to the rise of a new historical community—the Soviet people.

It would be opportune to recall that in his time the great proletarian internationalist, Lenin, emphasised that by demanding the right to secession for "all ... oppressed and unequal nations without exception" the Bolsheviks were not in the least bent on secession and did so *only* because they stood for "*free, voluntary* association and merging as distinct from forcible association. That is the *only* reason!"¹

United in a new, Soviet historical community, cemented by the *voluntariness* of their drawing together and merger, the nations and nationalities of the USSR form a monolithic whole.

This is also the reason underlying the vigorous efforts of the anti-Soviet writers who would have liked to see the disintegration of the USSR, to present the right of the Central Asian nations to self-determination as illusory.

Some "globally thinking" Sovietologists such as Brzezinski and Mosely, "enlarge" on this idea, picking up and developing notions about a possible future alliance of the socialist Central Asian republics with other countries on the basis of a "Muslim community" (?). Indeed, it does seem that all means will do so long as the USSR, the bulwark of peace and progress, is made to fall apart. Needless to say, they know that this will never happen. But they are hoping to bring about a split in the relations between the Soviet Union and the neighbouring Muslim states.

In view of the above and taking into account that 50 years have passed since the establishment of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, it is worth recalling what Leonid Brezhnev said in his report to the 24th CPSU Congress: "For its political significance and socio-economic consequences

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 23, p. 67.

the formation of the USSR occupies a prominent place in the history of our state."¹

* * *

Summing up what has been said in this book, let us examine, even if schematically, the dialectics of the solution of the national question in the USSR, and thus obtain further proof of the deliberately fallacious approach of the anti-Soviet writers.

First, it is necessary to determine the difference in the dialectics of the general historical development and the dialectics of the exploiter class in this question.

Glancing at the national question retrospectively and in its global perspective, one immediately discerns a regularity which can be briefly expressed in the following dialectical formula—*achievement of multinational unity*.

In an exploiter society, however, the drawing together of peoples on this objective basis is inevitably achieved by means of *violence* (in one form or another). Therefore, in such society there is another tendency, one which clashes with the above-mentioned objective basis, a centrifugal tendency characterised by the desire of the peoples to get rid of the forcibly imposed alliances and associations, overthrow foreign oppression, and so forth.

Present-day developments show how strong this second tendency is. In this connection it should be noted that it exists not only in the Third World (national liberation movement in the colonies or in the extant dictatorships), but also in the advanced capitalist countries in Europe and America.

Wherein lies the fundamental difference between the Marxist and the bourgeois approach to reconciling these two opposing tendencies and the solution of the national question itself? Marxists consider that within the framework of the above-mentioned common objective regularity, the international unity of the peoples should be achieved as a result of their *voluntary* and not forcible drawing together

and fusion. Accordingly, Marxism-Leninism advanced the following fundamental radical method of achieving this objective—the abolition of the very socio-economic conditions which breed the second tendency, that is, exploitation of man by man and the resulting oppression of one people by another. The Marxists set forth their position over a century ago in the form of the formula: "In proportion as the antagonism between classes within the nation vanishes, the hostility of one nation to another will come to an end". (K. Marx and F. Engels, *Manifesto of the Communist Party*).¹ Another, and a more vivid, formula is: "Any nation that oppresses another forges its own chains".² In other words, the Marxists put the question this way: only socialist revolution which abolishes the socio-economic foundations of any oppression simultaneously makes it possible to eliminate the antagonisms between nations and creates conditions for a gradual and voluntary drawing together of nations and nationalities.

Since Marxists are working for universal social equality of people not only in conditions when there is no exploitation of man by man, but also in conditions of their full equality and the availability of equal opportunities, they are naturally concerned, and for that matter more than any one else, in a just and final solution of the national question without which they will be unable to achieve their main objective, the building of communism.

Let us now examine the dialectics of socialist society. In a society where the victorious socialist revolution has overthrown a regime characterised by national enmity, the national question is solved not only on a fundamentally different, anti-exploiter basis, but also in conformity with another (within the framework of a common) dialectics, namely the *gradual drawing together through the all-round flowering of nations*. The flowering of nations, which is impossible in a multinational exploiter society, becomes possible in socialist society. Just as national oppression and the

¹ 24th Congress of the CPSU, Moscow, p. 91.

¹ Marx, Engels, *Selected Works* in three volumes, 1969, Vol. 1, p. 125.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 176.

centrifugal tendency are typical of an exploiter society, national liberation and the drawing together of nations are typical of socialist society.

The interconnection of the above tendencies with their socio-economic systems has a *decisive impact on all matters* related to the solution of the national question. Incidentally, this interconnection is deliberately hushed up by all the numerous Sovietologists who are making such great efforts to put a false colouring on the solution of the national question in the USSR in the hope that by slandering its experience, they would succeed in scaring off the peoples of the non-socialist countries from studying it.

Let us illustrate the thesis about this determinant distinction by replying to several pertinent questions.

What is the political goal of national liberation in the non-socialist concept? Usually it is the formation of an independent state, and less frequently the achievement of maximum autonomy within a federation. The bourgeoisie, both national and imperialist, takes advantage of this concept to limit this goal to national isolation and, therefore, cultivates or foments nationalism. State secession, however, is not an aim in itself for the people, the working people, who seek it, but as a means enabling them to safeguard their social interests and exercise their social and national rights to the full. National statehood offers them the means to fight for the improvement of *their* conditions, the conditions of the working people. But that, however, is not in the interests of the bourgeoisie.

What is the goal of national liberation in the Marxist understanding of the term? It consists in the abolition of national oppression and the establishment of national equality. It is aimed at ensuring social justice, that is, the rights of all people irrespective of their nationality. And that has been achieved in the USSR.

What is national equality from the bourgeois democratic point of view? It is the equality of people before the law irrespective of nationality, or equal rights of ethnic groups within the federation.

What is national equality in a socialist society? It means not only equality before the law but also the abolition of

actual inequality and the inequality of opportunities both for representatives of individual nationalities and for their compact national groups. This has been achieved in the USSR.

What is the meaning of "national interest" in an exploiter society? It is the interest of the socially and politically dominant upper stratum of a given nation, its bourgeoisie or some other class of lords and masters, who being in power claim to be representative of the entire nation.

Here, the so-called national interest as a rule clashes with the genuine national interest of the overwhelming majority of the nation, its sole producer of material values, the interests of the people as a whole and the working people above all. In particular, this interest usually mirrors national ego-centrism and chauvinism which is to the advantage of the ruling circles.

What is the "national interest" of a socialist nation? It is the interest of its working people, of those who create and who own its wealth. Consequently, here there is only one national interest.

Since national freedom rests on the social and class international unity of the working people of all nations and nationalities, their national interests find their expression in, and organically combine with, the interests of the federation as a whole.

There is no need to cite other examples to see how the national question in an exploiter society, where it has not been solved, or is not being solved, differs both in essence and from the psychological point of view from the solution of the national question in socialist society. How are the dialectics of a socialist society developing today?

A clear understanding of the above-mentioned fundamental distinction makes it possible also to comprehend the gradual shift in the dialectical correlation of parts of the formula for solving the national question which is objectively taking place in an advanced socialist society. Its characteristic feature is that the all-round florescence of nations is accompanied by a steady deepening and broadening of the process of their all-round gradual drawing together; that the *drawing together and fusion* of nations is gradually becoming

ing the core of the question, and not due to someone's "ill will", but objectively, in keeping with the historical regularity which has been mentioned above.

This is taking place in a favourable climate created by all the peoples of the USSR in the course of fifty years as a result of their joint heroic efforts both in the field of a peaceful endeavour and in numerous bitter battles against imperialist invaders. In the social sphere this climate is characterised by non-existence of antagonistic classes and the mounting social homogeneity of the country's population; in the moral and political sphere, by friendship of peoples, an unprecedented historical factor whose beneficial impact cannot be overestimated: in the economic sphere, by the voluntary division of labour which makes the country's economic complexes of national territorial subdivisions mutually supplementing elements of a single whole—the economy of the USSR; by a single Marxist ideology, in the ideological sphere.

This climate is the product of the Leninist nationalities policy of the CPSU and the resulting florescence of the Soviet nations and nationalities. It has opened the way for the broadening and deepening of the two-in-one process of the burgeoning and the *drawing together* of nations.

One manifestation of this has been the appearance of a new historical community of people, the Soviet people, in the USSR, as the 24th Congress of the CPSU has pointed out. Contrary to the assertions of some Sovietologists, it is neither a result of the "assimilation by the Russians" of other peoples, nor is it the rise of a "new ethnic community", but the formation of a completely new international and socio-political community.

The development of national relations in the USSR has entered a qualitatively new stage when alongside the flowering of nations the objectively progressing gradual drawing together of Soviet nations and nationalities is becoming a factor of increasing historical importance.

"The building of the multinational Soviet state has brilliantly confirmed the Marxist-Leninist conclusions:

"that the national question can be consistently solved only on the basis of the socialist reconstruction of society;

"that in contrast to formal bourgeois democracy, which proclaims but has never actually practised national equality, socialist democracy guarantees equal rights and opportunities to the peoples, creates conditions for resolving national issues with due regard for the fundamental interests of the working people of all nationalities;

"that the solid unity, the all-round flowering and steadfast drawing together of all nations and nationalities of the Soviet Union arise from the very nature of our system, and are an objective regularity of socialist development;

"that a union of socialist republics is the most viable and perfect form of organisation of a multinational state in which the interests of the society as a whole and the interest of each nation are harmoniously combined.

"Thus, the Marxist-Leninist teaching on the national question has been tested in practice and the Leninist nationalities policy has been fully victorious."¹

The Soviet people have achieved their magnificent gains as a result of their joint labour and the consistent implementation of the nationalities policy of the CPSU. A new historical community of people, the Soviet people, took shape in the course of socialist construction.

In this connection the 24th Congress of the CPSU underlined in its resolution: "It is necessary to continue carrying forward steadily the Leninist policy of consolidating the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the basis of the common interests of the Soviet state, taking into account the conditions of the development of each of its constituent republics, and working steadfastly for the further flowering of all the socialist nations and for their gradual drawing together."²

¹ *Pravda*, February 22, 1972.

² *24th Congress of the CPSU*, Moscow, p. 226.